

For Six Month Period Ending May 31, 2007
(Insert date)

I - REGISTRANT

1. (a) Name of Registrant (b) Registration No.

Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC

5430

(c) Business Address(es) of Registrant

1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest - Tenth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20004

2. Has there been a change in the information previously furnished in connection with the following:

(a) If an individual:
(1) Residence address Yes ☐ No ☐
(2) Citizenship Yes ☐ No ☐
(3) Occupation Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) If an organization:
(1) Name Yes ☐ No ☒
(2) Ownership or control Yes ☐ No ☒
(3) Branch offices Yes ☐ No ☒

(c) Explain fully all changes, if any, indicated in items (a) and (b) above.
N/A

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:11
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

IF THE REGISTRANT IS AN INDIVIDUAL, OMIT RESPONSE TO ITEMS 3, 4 AND 5(a).

3. If you have previously filed Exhibit C¹, state whether any changes therein have occurred during this 6 month reporting period.

Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, have you filed an amendment to the Exhibit C? Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please attach the required amendment.

¹ The Exhibit C, for which no printed form is provided, consists of a true copy of the charter, articles of incorporation, association, and by laws of a registrant that is an organization. (A waiver of the requirement to file an Exhibit C may be obtained for good cause upon written application to the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530.)

4. (a) Have any persons ceased acting as partners, officers, directors or similar officials of the registrant during this 6 month reporting period? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, furnish the following information:

Name	Position	Date connection ended
N/A		

- (b) Have any persons become partners, officers, directors or similar officials during this 6 month reporting period? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, furnish the following information:

Name	Residence address	Citizenship	Position	Date assumed
N/A				

5. (a) Has any person named in item 4(b) rendered services directly in furtherance of the interests of any foreign principal? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, identify each such person and describe his service.

N/A

- (b) Have any employees or individuals, who have filed a short form registration statement, terminated their employment or connection with the registrant during this 6 month reporting period? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, furnish the following information:

Name	Position or connection	Date terminated
N/A		

- (c) During this 6 month reporting period, has the registrant hired as employees or in any other capacity, any persons who rendered or will render services to the registrant directly in furtherance of the interests of any foreign principal(s) in other than a clerical or secretarial, or in a related or similar capacity? Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, furnish the following information:

Name	Residence address	Citizenship	Position	Date assumed
Ingrid Belton Henick	4201 Yuma St., NW, WDC 20016	U.S.A.	Vice Pres., BGRI	08/14/2006
Laura J. Celeste Ward	240 S. Reynolds St. #205, Alex., VA 22304	U.S.A.	Vice Pres., BGRI	04/01/2007
John Walker Roberts	6413 Western Ave., NW, WDC 20015	U.S.A.	Vice Pres., BGRI	01/01/2006

6. Have short form registration statements been filed by all of the persons named in Items 5(a) and 5(c) of the supplemental statement? Yes ☒ No ☐

If no, list names of persons who have not filed the required statement.

N/A

II - FOREIGN PRINCIPAL

7. Has your connection with any foreign principal ended during this 6 month reporting period?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, furnish the following information:

Name of foreign principal

Date of termination

8. Have you acquired any new foreign principal² during this 6 month reporting period?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, furnish the following information:

Name and address of foreign principal

Date acquired

N/A

9. In addition to those named in Items 7 and 8, if any, list foreign principals² whom you continued to represent during the 6 month reporting period.

Kurdistan Regional Government – Iraq
Embassy of the State of Qatar
Embassy of the Republic of India
Serbia
Republic of China (Taiwan)

10. **EXHIBITS A AND B**

(a) Have you filed for each of the newly acquired foreign principals in Item 8 the following:

Exhibit A ³	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Exhibit B ⁴	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

If no, please attach the required exhibit.

(b) Have there been any changes in the Exhibits A and B previously filed for any foreign principal whom you represented during the 6 month period? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, have you filed an amendment to these exhibits? Yes ☐ No ☐

If no, please attach the required amendment.

² The term "foreign principal" includes, in addition to those defined in Section 1(b) of the Act, an individual organization any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign government, foreign political party, foreign organization or foreign individual. (See Rule 100(a) (9).) A registrant who represents more than one foreign principal is required to list in the statements he files under the Act only those principals for whom he is not entitled to claim exemption under Section 3 of the Act. (See Rule 208.)

³ The Exhibit A, which is filed on Form CRM-157 (Formerly OBD-67), sets forth the information required to be disclosed concerning each foreign principal.

⁴ The Exhibit B, which is filed on Form CRM-155 (Formerly OBD-65), sets forth the information concerning the agreement or understanding between the registrant and the foreign principal.

III - ACTIVITIES

-
11. During this 6 month reporting period, have you engaged in any activities for or rendered any services to any foreign principal named in Items 7, 8, and 9 of this statement? Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, identify each such foreign principal and describe in full detail your activities and services:

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

-
12. During this 6 month reporting period, have you on behalf of any foreign principal engaged in political activity⁵ as defined below? Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, identify each such foreign principal and describe in full detail all such political activity, indicating, among other things, the relations, interests and policies sought to be influenced and the means employed to achieve this purpose. If the registrant arranged, sponsored or delivered speeches, lectures or radio and TV broadcasts, give details as to dates and places of delivery, names of speakers and subject matter.

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

-
13. In addition to the above described activities, if any, have you engaged in activity on your own behalf which benefits any or all of your foreign principals? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, describe fully.

N/A

⁵ The term "political activities" means any activity that the person engaging in believes will, or that the person intends to, in any way influence any agency or official of the Government of the United States or any section of the public within the United States with reference to formulating, adopting or changing the domestic or foreign policies of the United States or with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party.

IV - FINANCIAL INFORMATION

14. (a) RECEIPTS-MONIES

During this 6 month reporting period, have you received from any foreign principal named in Items 7, 8, and 9 of this statement, or from any other source, for or in the interests of any such foreign principal, any contributions, income or money either as compensation or otherwise? Yes ☒ No ☐

If no, explain why.

N/A

If yes, set forth below in the required detail and separately for each foreign principal an account of such monies⁶

Date	From whom	Purpose	Amount
PLEASE SEE ATTACHED			

Total

(b) RECEIPTS - FUND RAISING CAMPAIGN

During this 6 month reporting period, have you received, as part of a fund raising campaign⁷, any money on behalf of any foreign principal named in items 7, 8, and 9 of this statement? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, have you filed an Exhibit D⁸ to your registration? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, indicate the date the Exhibit D was filed. Date _____

(c) RECEIPTS - THINGS OF VALUE

During this 6 month reporting period, have you received any thing of value⁹ other than money from any foreign principal named in Items 7, 8, and 9 of this statement, or from any other source, for or in the interests of any such foreign principal? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, furnish the following information:

Name of foreign principal	Date received	Description of thing of value	Purpose
------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------	---------

⁶ 7 A registrant is required to file an Exhibit D if he collects or receives contributions, loans, money, or other things of value for a foreign principal, as part of a fund raising campaign. (See Rule 201(e).)

⁸ An Exhibit D, for which no printed form is provided, sets forth an account of money collected or received as a result of a fund raising campaign and transmitted for a foreign principal.

⁹ Things of value include but are not limited to gifts, interest free loans, expense free travel, favored stock purchases, exclusive rights, favored treatment over competitors, "kickbacks," and the like.

15. (a) DISBURSEMENTS – MONIES

During this 6 month reporting period, have you

(1) disbursed or expended monies in connection with activity on behalf of any foreign principal named in Items 7, 8, and 9 of this statement? Yes ☐ No ☒

(2) transmitted monies to any such foreign principal? Yes ☐ No ☒

If no, explain in full detail why there were no disbursements made on behalf of any foreign principal.

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

If yes, set forth below in the required detail and separately for each foreign principal an account of such monies, including monies transmitted, if any, to each foreign principal.

Date	To whom	Purpose	Amount
N/A			

Total

(b) DISBURSEMENTS – THINGS OF VALUE

During this 6 month reporting period, have you disposed of anything of value¹⁰ other than money in furtherance of or in connection with activities on behalf of any foreign principal named in Items 7, 8, and 9 of this statement?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, furnish the following information:

Date disposed	Name of person to whom given	On behalf of what foreign principal	Description of thing of value	Purpose
---------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------

N/A

(c) DISBURSEMENTS – POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

During this 6 month reporting period, have you from your own funds and on your own behalf either directly or through any other person, made any contributions of money or other things of value¹¹ in connection with an election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for political office?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, furnish the following information:

Date	Amount or thing of value	Name of political organization	Name of candidate
------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------

PLEASE SEE
ATTACHED

^{10, 11} Things of value include but are not limited to gifts, interest free loans, expense free travel, favored stock purchases, exclusive rights, favored treatment over competitors, "kickbacks" and the like.

V - INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

16. During this 6 month reporting period, did you prepare, disseminate or cause to be disseminated any informational materials ¹²?
 Yes ☒ No ☐

IF YES, RESPOND TO THE REMAINING ITEMS IN SECTION V.

17. Identify each such foreign principal.

Kurdistan Regional Government - Iraq
 Serbia

18. During this 6 month reporting period, has any foreign principal established a budget or allocated a specified sum of money to finance your activities in preparing or disseminating informational materials? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, identify each such foreign principal, specify amount, and indicate for what period of time.

N/A

19. During this 6 month reporting period, did your activities in preparing, disseminating or causing the dissemination of informational materials include the use of any of the following:

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Radio or TV broadcasts | <input type="checkbox"/> Magazine or newspaper articles | <input type="checkbox"/> Motion picture films | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Letters or telegrams |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advertising campaigns | <input type="checkbox"/> Press releases | <input type="checkbox"/> Pamphlets or other publications | <input type="checkbox"/> Lectures or speeches |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internet | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) <u>E-mail Correspondence</u> | | |

20. During this 6 month reporting period, did you disseminate or cause to be disseminated informational materials among any of the following groups:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Officials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Newspapers | <input type="checkbox"/> Libraries |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Legislators | <input type="checkbox"/> Editors | <input type="checkbox"/> Educational institutions |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government agencies | <input type="checkbox"/> Civic groups or associations | <input type="checkbox"/> Nationality groups |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____ | | |

21. What language was used in the informational materials:

- ☒ English ☐ Other (specify) _____

22. Did you file with the Registration Unit, U.S. Department of Justice a copy of each item of such informational materials disseminated or caused to be disseminated during this 6 month reporting period? Yes ☒ No ☐

23. Did you label each item of such informational materials with the statement required by Section 4(b) of the Act? Yes ☒ No ☐

¹² The term informational materials includes any oral, visual, graphic, written, or pictorial information or matter of any kind, including that published by means of advertising, books, periodicals, newspapers, lectures, broadcasts, motion pictures, or any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or otherwise. Informational materials disseminated by an agent of a foreign principal as part of an activity in itself exempt from registration, or an activity which by itself would not require registration, need not be filed pursuant to Section 4(b) of the Act.

VI – EXECUTION

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1746, the undersigned swear(s) or affirm(s) under penalty of perjury that he/she has (they have) read the information set forth in this registration statement and the attached exhibits and that he/she is (they are) familiar with the contents thereof and that such contents are in their entirety true and accurate to the best of his/her (their) knowledge and belief, except that the undersigned make(s) no representation as to the truth or accuracy of the information contained in the attached Short Form Registration Statement(s), if any, insofar as such information is not within his/her (their) personal knowledge.

(Date of signature)

June 29, 2007(Type or print name under each signature¹³)
G.O. Griffith, Jr.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:12
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

¹³ This statement shall be signed by the individual agent, if the registrant is an individual, or by a majority of those partners, officers, directors or persons performing similar functions, if the registrant is an organization, except that the organization can, by power of attorney, authorize one or more individuals to execute this statement on its behalf.



U.S. Department of Justice

Criminal Division

Washington, DC 20530

THIS FORM IS TO BE AN OFFICIAL ATTACHMENT TO YOUR CURRENT SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT -
PLEASE EXECUTE IN TRIPLICATE

SHORT-FORM REGISTRATION INFORMATION SHEET

SECTION A

The Department records list active short-form registration statements for the following persons of your organization filed on the date indicated by each name. If a person is not still functioning in the same capacity directly on behalf of the foreign principal, please show the date of termination.

Short Form List for Registrant: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC

Last Name	First Name and Other Names	Registration Date	Termination Date	Role
Griffith	Lanny	05/10/2001		
Imperatore	Brant	04/07/2005		
Monroe	Loren	05/10/2001		
Murphy	Dan	04/12/2002		
Parasiliti	Andrew	04/07/2005		
Rogers	Edward M. Jr.,	12/22/2004		
Blackwill	Robert D.	11/15/2005		
Ross	Shalla	04/28/2006		
Lukawski	Jennifer	04/28/2006		
Cunningham	William B.	05/02/2006		
Henick	Ingrid Belton	01/30/2007		
Roberts	John Walker	02/22/2007		
Ward	Laura Celeste J.	04/11/2007		

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:12
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT



U.S. Department of Justice

National Security Division

Washington, DC 20530

SECTION B

In addition to those persons listed in Section A, list below all current employees rendering services directly on behalf of the foreign principals(s) who have not filed short-form registration statements. (Do not list clerks, secretaries, typists or employees in a similar or related capacity). If there is some question as to whether an employee has an obligation to file a short-form, please address a letter to the Registration Unit describing the activities and connection with the foreign principal.

Name	Function	Date Hired

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Title: _____

*Addendum to the Supplemental Statement pursuant to Section 2 of the Foreign Agents
Registration Act of 1938, as amended.
Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC – Registration Number 5430*

Questions 11 & 12:

Preamble:

Kurdistan Regional Government:

During the six-month reporting period, the Registrant engaged in the following political activities (attached). The Registrant did not arrange, sponsor or deliver any speeches, lecture or radio and television broadcasts on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. All informational materials either distributed or facilitated by Registrant on behalf of Principal are attached.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:12
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Date of Contact	U.S. Govt. Official Contacted	Manner in Which Contact Was Made	Subject Matter
January 19	Meghan O'Sullivan, National Security Council	E-mail	U.S. / KRG Relations
January 19	Matthias Mitman, National Security Council	E-mail	U.S. / KRG Relations
January 23	Patrick Garvey, Senate Foreign Relations Committee	E-mail	U.S. / KRG Relations; Conveyed letter from Nechirvan Barzani
January 24	Ryan Crocker, Department of State	E-mail	U.S. / KRG Relations; Courtesy Call
January 31	Tom Warrick, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / KRG Relations
January 31	Meghan O'Sullivan, National Security Council	E-mail	U.S. / KRG Relations; Conveyed letter from Nechirvan Barzani
January 31	David Satterfield, Department of State	E-mail	U.S. / KRG Relations; Conveyed letter from Nechirvan Barzani
January 31	Patrick Garvey, Senate Foreign Relations Committee	Meeting, Telephone Call, E-mail	U.S. / KRG Relations
February 2	Kevin Bergner, National Security Council	Telephone Call	U.S. / KRG Relations
February 8	Tom Callahan, State Department	Telephone Call	KRG – Trade
February 14	Tim Betts, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / KRG Relations
February 21	Alan Makovsky, House International Relations Committee	Meeting	U.S. / KRG Relations
February 23	Alan Makovsky, House International Relations Committee	Meeting	U.S. / KRG Relations
February 23	Puneet Talwar, Senate Foreign	E-mail	U.S. / KRG Relations; Conveyed

	Relations Committee		letter from Nechirvan Barzani
February 28	Tom Hawkins, Senator Mitch McConnell (R-KY)	Telephone Call	U.S. / KRG Relations
March 1	Sean Reilly, Department of Commerce	E-mail	U.S. / KRG Relations; Letter from Ed Rogers
March 2	Bill Luti, National Security Council	Meeting	U.S. / KRG Relations
March 28	Doug Campbell, Congressman Howard Berman (D- CA)	Telephone Call	U.S. / KRG Relations
April 10	Tom Hawkins, Senator Mitch McConnell (R-KY)	Telephone Call	U.S. / KRG Relations
April 20	Meghan O'Sullivan, National Security Council	Meeting	U.S. / KRG Relations
April 27	David Satterfield, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / KRG Relations
May 10	David Satterfield, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / KRG Relations
May 30	David Satterfield, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / KRG Relations
May 30	Charles Dunne, National Security Council	Telephone Call	KRG – Recent Developments

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:13
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

*Addendum to the Supplemental Statement pursuant to Section 2 of the Foreign Agents
Registration Act of 1938, as amended.
Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC – Registration Number 5430*

Questions 11 & 12:

Preamble:

Republic of China (Taiwan):

During the six-month reporting period, the Registrant engaged in the following political activities (attached). The Registrant did not arrange, sponsor or deliver any speeches, lecture or radio and television broadcasts on behalf of the Republic of China (Taiwan).

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:12
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Date of Contact	U.S. Govt. Official Contacted	Manner in Which Contact Was Made	Subject Matter
January 1	Dennis Wilder, National Security Council	E-mail	US/Taiwan Relations
January 3	Steve Fagin, Department of State	Telephone Call, E-mail	US/Taiwan Relations
January 3	R. Nicholas Burns, Department of State	E-mail, Letter	US/Taiwan Relations
January 3	Dennis Wilder, National Security Council	E-mail	US/Taiwan Relations
January 4	Chris Donesa, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 4	Michael Meermans, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 6	Mike Sheehy, Office of the Speaker	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 7	John Stivers, Office of the Speaker	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 10	Jaime McCormick, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 10	Dennis Halpin, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail and Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 11	Kevin Fitzpatrick, Office of Congressman Steve Chabot	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 12	Dennis Halpin, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 16	Peter Yeo, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 16	Dennis Wilder, National Security Council	E-mail	US/Taiwan Relations
January 18	Peter Yeo, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 18	Lisa Williams, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations

January 19	Kevin Fitzpatrick, Office of Congressman Steve Chabot	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 19	Doug Campbell, Office of Congressman Howard Berman	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 19	Dennis Wilder, National Security Council	E-mail and Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 19	Peter Yeo, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 19	David Adams, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 22	Doug Campbell, Office of Congressman Howard Berman	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 22	Neil Hedlund, Defense Security Cooperation Agency	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 22	Rick Kessler, Office of Senator Daniel Akaka	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 23	Dennis Halpin, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 23	Dennis Wilder, National Security Council	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 23	Guido Zucconi, Office of Congressman Tom Lantos	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 25	Jaime McCormick, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 25	Doug Campbell, Office of Congressman Howard Berman	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 25	Dennis Halpin, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 25	Lisa Williams, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 29	Doug Campbell, Office of Congressman Howard Berman	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 30	Doug Campbell, Office of Congressman Howard	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations

	Berman		
January 30	Peter Yeo, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 30	Paul Berkowitz, Office of Congressman Dana Rohrabacher	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 30	Kevin Fitzpatrick, Office of Congressman Steve Chabot	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 30	Lisa Williams, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 31	Dennis Halpin, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 31	Rick Kessler, Office of Senator Daniel Akaka	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 31	Scott Feeney, Department of Defense	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 31	Peter Yeo, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 31	Mitch Waldman, Office of Senator Mitch McConnell	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 31	Dennis Wilder, National Security Council	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
January 31	Dennis Halpin, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Meeting	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 1	Kevin Fitzpatrick, Office of Congressman Steve Chabot	Phone Call and E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 2	Scott Feeney, Department of Defense	Meeting	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 2	Rick Kessler, Office of Senator Daniel Akaka	Meeting	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 5	Mitch Waldman, Office of Senator Mitch McConnell	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 5	Doug Campbell, Office of Congressman Howard Berman	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations

February 5	Lisa Williams, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 5	Mitch Waldman, Office of Senator Mitch McConnell	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 7	Doug Campbell, Office of Congressman Howard Berman	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 7	Kevin Fitzpatrick, Office of Congressman Steve Chabot	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 8	Richard Perry, Office of Senator Lindsay Graham	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 8	Peter Yeo, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Phone Call	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 12	Dennis Wilder, National Security Council	Meeting	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 13	Paul Berkowitz, Office of Congressman Dana Rohrabacher	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 14	Dennis Wilder, National Security Council	Meeting, Telephone call, E-mail	US/Taiwan Relations
February 14	R. Nicholas Burns, Department of State	E-mail	US/Taiwan Relations
February 14	Kevin Fitzpatrick, Office of Congressman Steve Chabot	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 14	Jessica Lewis, Office of Senator Robert Menendez	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
February 28	Yleem Pobleete, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
March 6	Jessica Lewis, Office of Senator Robert Menendez	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
March 6	Lisa Williams, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations
March 8	Dennis Halpin, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	US/Taiwan Bilateral Relations

*Addendum to the Supplemental Statement pursuant to Section 2 of the Foreign Agents
Registration Act of 1938, as amended.
Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC – Registration Number 5430*

Questions 11 & 12:

Preamble:

State of Qatar:

During the six-month reporting period, the Registrant engaged in the following political activities (attached). The Registrant did not arrange, sponsor or deliver any speeches, lecture or radio and television broadcasts on behalf of the State of Qatar.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4: 17
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

*Addendum to the Supplemental Statement pursuant to Section 2 of the Foreign Agents
Registration Act of 1938, as amended.
Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC – Registration Number 5430*

Questions 11 & 12:

Preamble:

Government of India:

During the six-month reporting period, the Registrant engaged in the following political activities (attached). The Registrant did not arrange, sponsor or deliver any speeches, lecture or radio and television broadcasts on behalf of the Government of India. All informational materials either distributed or facilitated by Registrant on behalf of Principal are attached.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4: 17
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Date of Contact	U.S. Govt. Official Contacted	Manner in Which Contact Was Made	Subject Matter
December 1	Jeff Bergner, Department of State	Telephone Call	India / Hyde Act
December 1	Tom Mooney, House International Affairs Committee	Telephone Call	India / Hyde Act
December 5	Puneet Talwar, Senate Foreign Affairs Committee	Telephone Call	India / Hyde Act
December 5	Tom Mooney, House International Affairs Committee	Telephone Call	India / Hyde Act
December 5	Hillel Weinberg, House International Affairs Committee	Telephone Call	India / Hyde Act
December 5	Brent Perry, Senator George Allen	Telephone Call	India / Hyde Act
December 5	Paul Teller, Republican Study Committee	Telephone Call	India / Hyde Act
December 5	Steve Rademaker, Senator Bill Frist (R-TN)	E-mail	India / Hyde Act
December 6	Jeff Bergner, Department of State	Telephone Call	India / Hyde Act
January 3	Yleem Pobleete, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	India - 123 Agreement
January 25	Newell Highsmith, Department of State	Phone Call	India - Status of nonproliferation legislation
January 25	Carol Schwab, Department of State	Phone Call	India – Status of nonproliferation legislation
January 29	David Abramowitz, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Meeting	India – 123 Agreement
January 30	R. Nicholas Burns, Department of State	Meeting	India—123 Agreement
January 31	Jane Alonso, Office of Senator Susan Collins (R-ME)	Telephone Call and E-mail	India – Status of nonproliferation legislation
January 31	Tom Moore, Senate Foreign Relations Committee	Telephone Call	India – 123 Agreement

February 7	David Abramowitz, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Telephone Call	India – 123 Agreement
February 7	David Fite, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Telephone Call	India – 123 Agreement
February 7	Tom Moore, Senate Foreign Relations Committee	E-mail	India – 123 Agreement
February 20	Alan Makovsky, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Meeting, Telephone Call	U.S. / India Relations
February 28	David Fite, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Meeting	U.S. / India Relations
March 29	Tim Rieser, Senate Appropriations Committee	E-mail	U.S. / India Relations
April 2	R. Nicholas Burns, Department of State	Meeting	U.S. / India Relations
April 10	Ken Myers, Senate Foreign Relations Committee	Telephone Call	U.S. / India Relations
April 11	Doug Seay, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	India / South Asian Affairs
April 16	Dave Adams, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	India / South Asian Affairs
April 17	Tom Sheehy, Congressman Ed Royce (R-CA)	Meeting	U.S. / India Relations
April 17	Mike Stransky, RPC	Telephone Call	U.S. / India Relations
April 18	Jeff Bergner, Department of State	E-mail	U.S. / India Relations
April 20	Claudia Lillieufeld, USTR	Telephone Call	U.S. / India Relations
April 20	Tim Morrison, Senator Jon Kyl (R-AZ)	E-mail	U.S. / India Relations
April 23	Jeff Bergner, Department of State	E-mail	Boxer-Kyle / U.S.-India
April 26	R. Nicholas Burns, Department of State	Telephone Call	India—123 Agreement

April 27	Tom Sheehy, Congressman Ed Royce (R-CA)	Meeting, Telephone Call	India—123 Agreement
April 27	Tim Rieser, Senate Appropriations Committee	E-mail	U.S. / India Relations, Iraq Appropriations
May 2	Dino Teppara, Congressman Joe Wilson (R-SC)	E-mail	Request for meeting for Indian Minister of State for External Affairs
May 2	Dave Adams, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	Request for External Affairs Meeting for Minister of State
May 3	Jeff Bergner, Department of State	E-mail	India—123 Agreement
May 11	Robert O'Connor, Department of Homeland Security	Telephone Call	U.S. / India / HR 1 & HR 1591
May 11	David Adams, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Telephone Call	U.S. / India Relations
May 15	Doug Seay, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Telephone Call	India – 123 Agreement
May 16	Jeff Bergner, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / India Legislative Issues
May 22	Deb Fiddelke, The White House	E-mail	India—H/1B Visa
May 22	Deb Fiddelke, The White House	Telephone Call	India – H/1B Visa
May 22	Jeff Bergner, Department of State	E-mail	India – H/1B Visa
May 23	Doug Seay, House Foreign Affairs Committee	Telephone Call	India / Iran
May 25	R. Nicholas Burns, Department of State	E-mail	India—123 Agreement
May 25	Stephen Hadley, National Security Council	E-mail	India—123 Agreement
May 31	Ambassador Doug Hartwick, US Trade Representative for South and Southwest Asia	Meeting	India – Trade Promotion Authority

*Addendum to the Supplemental Statement pursuant to Section 2 of the Foreign Agents
Registration Act of 1938, as amended.
Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC – Registration Number 5430*

Questions 11 & 12:

Preamble:

Serbia:

During the six-month reporting period, the Registrant engaged in the following political activities (attached). The Registrant did not arrange, sponsor or deliver any speeches, lecture or radio and television broadcasts on behalf of the Serbia. All informational materials either distributed or facilitated by Registrant on behalf of Principal are attached.

2017 JUN 29 PM 4:17
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Date of Contact	U.S. Govt. Official Contacted	Manner in Which Contact Was Made	Subject Matter
December 7	Rosemary DiCarlo, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
January 9	Rosemary DiCarlo, Department of State	Meeting	U.S. / Serbia Relations
January 18	Kay King, House Foreign Affairs Committee	E-mail	Serbia / Kosovo
January 31	Frank Wisner, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
March 5	Rosemary DiCarlo, Department of State	Meeting	U.S. / Serbia Relations
March 20	Frank Wisner, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
March 21	Bert Braun, National Security Council	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
March 26	Brian Fauls, Congressman Dan Burton (R-IN)	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
March 29	Bert Braun, National Security Council	Meeting, Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 2	Rosemary DiCarlo, Department of State	Meeting	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 3	LeAnn Holdman, Congressman Mike Pence (R-IN)	Meeting	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 4	Victoria Sanville, Congressman Peter Roskam (R-IL)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 10	LeAnn Holdman, Congressman Mike Pence (R-IN)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 11	Doug Campbell, Congressman Howard Berman (D-CA)	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 11	Frank Wisner, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 11	Jennifer Pavlik, Congressman Mike Pence (R-IN)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations

April 16	Dino Teppara, Congressman Joe Wilson (R-SC)	Telephone Call	U.S.. / Serbia Relations
April 16	Dino Teppara, Congressman Joe Wilson (R-SC)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 16	Doug Campbell, Congressman Howard Berman (D-CA)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 16	Colleen Gilbert, Congressman Dan Burton (R-IN)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 16	LeeAnn Holdman, Congressman Mike Pence (R-IN)	Telephone Call, E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 16	Kevin Fitzpatrick, Congressman Steve Chabot (R-OH)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 18	Congressman Chris Van Hollen (D-MD)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 18	Greg Adams, Congressman Diane Watson (D-CA)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 18	Colleen Gilbert, Congressman Dan Burton (R-IN)	E-mail	U.S. / Serbia Relations
April 24	Bert Braun, National Security Council	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
May 9	Bert Braun, National Security Council	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
May 17	Frank Wisner, Department of State	Telephone Call	U.S. / Serbia Relations
May 24	Rosemary DiCarlo, Department of State	Meeting	U.S / Serbia Relations
May 25	Bert Braun, The White House	Telephone Call	Serbia / Kosovo

Question 14(a) – Receipts-Monies:

Date	From Whom	Purpose	Amount
May 31, 2007	Serbia	Fees & Expenses	\$445,026.06
May 31, 2007	Republic of China (Taiwan)	Fees & Expenses	\$779,857.48
May 31, 2007	Republic of India, Embassy	Fees & Expenses	\$262,499.00
May 31, 2007	State of Qatar, Embassy	Fees & Expenses	\$210,488.62
May 31, 2007	Kurdistan Regional Government	Fees & Expenses	\$381,487.78
<i>Total:</i>			<i>\$2,079,358.94</i>

Question 15(a) – Disbursements-Monies:

The nature of services provided by registrant (consulting and lobbying) do not require disbursements of monies to or on behalf of foreign principals named in items 7, 8, and 9.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4: 17
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Question 15(c) – Political Contributions:**Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC:**

2/6/07	Roskam for Congress	\$2142
1/30/07	RedPAC	\$2000
3/19/07	Elizabeth Dole Committee	\$1000
2/26/07	McConnell for Senate	\$2000
5/24/07	Walsh for Congress	\$1000

Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC:

3/15/07	Republican Governors Association	\$15,000
3/19/07	DC Republican Committee	\$2000
3/20/07	NRCC	\$15,000
4/3/07	Republican State Leadership Committee	\$5000

G.O. Griffith, Jr.

Date	Committee Name	Amount
5/7/2007	Bachus for Congress	\$ 111
3/22/2007	Goodlatte for Congress	\$ 56
2/6/2007	Roskam for Congress	\$ 111
5/16/2007	Ryan for Congress	\$ 111
5/7/2007	Walsh for Congress Committee	\$ 111
3/20/2007	NRCC (Federal)	\$ 1,667
4/15/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
3/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
2/8/2007	SNOW PAC	\$ 167
1/30/2007	RED PAC	\$ 111
3/18/2007	Rudy Giuliani Presidential Exploratory Committee	\$ 200
3/18/2007	Rudy Giuliani Presidential Exploratory Committee	\$ 2,300
1/1/2007	Rudy Giuliani Presidential Exploratory Committee	\$ 2,100
4/10/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 300
4/10/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 2,300
3/19/2007	Elizabeth Dole Committee	\$ 1,800
5/8/2007	People for Pete Domenici	\$ 112
2/25/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 1,000
2/26/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 111
2/22/2007	Stevens for Senate Committee	\$ 111
5/5/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 5,000
3/31/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 112
3/5/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 5,000
12/6/2007	Friends of Bobby Jindal	\$ 375
4/12/2007	Friends of Cory Wilson	\$ 500
4/2/2007	Mabel Murphee for Public Service Commission	\$ 500
4/26/2007	Bob Corker for Senate	\$ 55
4/17/2007	Demint for Senate	\$ 111
3/8/2007	Shelby for US Senate	\$ 222

Brant Imperatore**Committee**

Date	Name	Amount
5/7/2007	Bachus for Congress	\$ 111
3/28/2007	Baker for Congress	\$ 500
3/22/2007	Goodlatte for Congress	\$ 56
2/6/2007	Roskam for Congress	\$ 111
5/16/2007	Ryan for Congress	\$ 111
5/7/2007	Walsh for Congress Committee	\$ 111
3/20/2007	NRCC (Federal)	\$ 1,667
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
4/15/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
2/5/2007	Growth & Prosperity PAC	\$ 2,000
2/8/2007	SNOW PAC	\$ 167
1/30/2007	RED PAC	\$ 111
4/11/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 125
5/8/2007	People for Pete Domenici	\$ 111
2/26/2007	McConnell for Senate Committee	\$ 111
2/22/2007	Stevens for Senate Committee	\$ 111
3/31/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 111
12/6/2006	Friends of Bobby Jindal	\$ 375
1/13/2007	Vitter for Senate	\$ 1,500
4/26/2007	Bob Corker for Senate	\$ 56
4/17/2007	Demint for Senate	\$ 500
4/17/2007	Demint for Senate	\$ 111
3/8/2007	Shelby for US Senate	\$ 222

Loren Monroe

Date	Committee Name	Amount
5/7/2007	Bachus for Congress	\$ 112
1/22/2007	Feeney for Congress	\$ 500
3/22/2007	Goodlatte for Congress	\$ 56
2/6/2007	Roskam for Congress	\$ 111
5/16/2007	Ryan for Congress	\$ 111
5/7/2007	Walsh for Congress Committee	\$ 111
3/20/2007	NRCC (Federal)	\$ 1,667
1/31/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
4/15/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
2/8/2007	SNOW PAC	\$ 167
1/30/2007	REDPac	\$ 111
5/14/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 500
4/11/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 125
3/22/2007	People for Pete Domenici	\$ 1,000
5/8/2007	People for Pete Domenici	\$ 111
2/26/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 111
3/22/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 2,000
2/22/2007	Stevens for Senate Committee	\$ 111
3/5/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 2,500
3/31/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 111
12/6/2007	Friends of Bobby Jindal	\$ 375
4/10/2007	Anne Northrup Hoover for Governor	\$ 1,000
4/26/2007	Bob Corker for Senate	\$ 55

4/17/2007	Demint for Senate	\$	111
3/8/2007	Shelby for US Senate	\$	222

Dan Murphy

Date	Committee Name	Amount
5/7/2007	Bachus for Congress	\$ 111
4/10/2007	Feeney for Congress	\$ 500
3/28/2007	Feeney for Congress	\$ 500
3/22/2007	Goodlatte for Congress	\$ 55
2/6/2007	Roskam for Congress	\$ 111
5/16/2007	Ryan for Congress	\$ 111
5/7/2007	Walsh for Congress Committee	\$ 111
3/20/2007	NRCC (Federal)	\$ 1,667
4/15/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
2/8/2007	SNOW PAC	\$ 167
1/30/2007	REDPac	\$ 111
4/11/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 125
5/17/2007	Elizabeth Dole Committee	\$ 500
5/8/2007	People for Pete Domenici	\$ 111
2/26/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 111
2/22/2007	Stevens for Senate Committee	\$ 111
3/31/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 111
12/6/2006	Friends of Bobby Jindal	\$ 375
4/26/2007	Bob Corker for Senate	\$ 56
4/17/2007	Demint for Senate	\$ 111
3/8/2007	Shelby for US Senate	\$ 222

Andrew Parasiliti

Date	Committee Name	Amount
5/31/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 150
4/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 75
4/13/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 75
3/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 150
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 75
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 75
1/31/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 500
2/26/2007	Sandhills PAC	\$ 500
4/4/2007	Coleman for Senate	\$ 500
2/1/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 500
2/1/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 500
4/4/2007	Demint for Senate	\$ 500

Ed Rogers

Date	Committee Name	Amount
5/7/2007	Bachus for Congress	\$ 111
3/22/2007	Goodlatte for Congress	\$ 56
2/6/2007	Roskam for Congress	\$ 111

5/16/2007	Ryan for Congress	\$	111
5/7/2007	Walsh for Congress Committee	\$	111
3/20/2007	NRCC (Federal)	\$	1,667
3/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$	1,250
4/15/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$	1,250
2/8/2007	SNOW PAC	\$	167
1/30/2007	REDPac	\$	111
3/22/2007	Rudy Giuliani Presidential Exploratory Committee	\$	2,300
2/2/2007	John McCain 2008	\$	2,300
4/11/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$	125
5/8/2007	People for Pete Domenici	\$	111
2/26/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$	1,000
2/26/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$	111
2/22/2007	Stevens for Senate Committee	\$	111
3/31/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$	111
3/5/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$	25,000
12/6/2006	Friends of Bobby Jindal	\$	375
4/26/2007	Bob Corker for Senate	\$	55
4/17/2007	Demint for Senate	\$	111
3/8/2007	Shelby for US Senate	\$	222

Amb. Robert D. Blackwill

Date	Committee Name	Amount
3/22/2007	Goodlatte for Congress	\$ 55
2/6/2007	Roskam for Congress	\$ 111
5/16/2007	Ryan for Congress	\$ 111
5/7/2007	Walsh for Congress Committee	\$ 112
3/20/2007	NRCC (Federal)	\$ 1,666
4/15/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
2/8/2007	SNOW PAC	\$ 166
1/30/2007	REDPac	\$ 111
4/11/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 125
5/8/2007	People for Pete Domenici	\$ 111
2/26/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 111
2/22/2007	Stevens for Senate Committee	\$ 111
3/31/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 111
5/7/2007	Bachus for Congress	\$ 111
4/26/2007	Bob Corker for Senate	\$ 56
4/17/2007	Demint for Senate	\$ 111
3/8/2007	Shelby for US Senate	\$ 222

Shalla Ross

Date	Committee Name	Amount
3/12/2007	Dave Camp for Congress	\$ 500
5/31/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100
4/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 50
4/13/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 50
3/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100

2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$	50
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$	50
1/31/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$	1,000
2/27/2007	Romney for President	\$	500
2/26/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$	1,000
4/17/2007	Demint for Senate	\$	500

Jennifer Larkin Lukawski

Date	Committee Name	Amount
5/7/2007	Bachus for Congress	\$ 111
3/22/2007	Goodlatte for Congress	\$ 55
2/6/2007	Roskam for Congress	\$ 112
5/16/2007	Ryan for Congress	\$ 111
5/7/2007	Walsh for Congress Committee	\$ 111
3/20/2007	NRCC (Federal)	\$ 1,666
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
4/15/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,250
2/8/2007	SNOW PAC	\$ 166
3/22/2007	Freedom Fund	\$ 1,000
1/30/2007	REDPac	\$ 112
4/11/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 125
4/20/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 500
4/4/2007	Alexander for Senate	\$ 500
5/8/2007	People for Pete Domenici	\$ 111
2/26/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 111
2/23/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 1,000
2/22/2007	Stevens for Senate Committee	\$ 112
3/31/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 111
2/22/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 1,000
12/6/2007	Friends of Bobby Jindal	\$ 375
4/26/2007	Bob Corker for Senate	\$ 56
4/17/2007	DeMint for Senate	\$ 111
3/8/2007	Shelby for US Senate	\$ 223

Bryan Cunningham

Date	Committee Name	Amount
4/30/2007	Cantor for Congress	\$ 500
5/31/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 200
4/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100
4/13/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100
3/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 200
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100
5/17/2007	John McCain 2008	\$ 300
3/7/2007	John McCain 2008	\$ 1,000
3/7/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 1,000
12/19/2006	Marc Cadin for Delegate	\$ 250
3/7/2007	Barbour for Governor	\$ 1,000

Ingrid Belton Henick

Date	Committee Name	Amount
3/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 1,000
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 500
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 500

Walker Roberts

Date	Committee Name	Amount
3/12/2007	Roskam for Congress	\$ 250
5/31/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 200
4/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100
4/13/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100
3/30/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 200
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100
2/28/2007	Barbour Griffith & Rogers PAC	\$ 100
5/22/2007	Texans fro Senator John Cornyn	\$ 1,000
3/12/2007	McConnell Senate Committee	\$ 500

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:17
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]

Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2006 6:19 PM

Subject: Statement by KRG President Masoud Barzani on The Iraq Study Group Report

**Translation of Official Statement by
Masoud Barzani
President of the Kurdistan Regional Government of Iraq
7 December 2006**

After studying the report prepared by the Iraq Study Group we deem it necessary to issue the following statement.

- 1) The failure of the Iraq Study Group to visit the Kurdistan Region was a major shortcoming in its information gathering process; this alone detracts from the credibility of the report.
- 2) In recommendation 26 of the report, the Iraq Study Group asks for a constitutional review, with assistance from the United Nations, any review of the constitution should be strictly in accord with the mechanisms stated in the constitution. We reject any constitutional review outside of the mechanisms created for this purpose within the Iraqi Constitution. The unity of Iraq is preserved by the terms of the Iraqi Constitution.
- 3) Recommendation 28 of the report states that all oil revenues should accrue to the central government and be shared on the basis of population. It further states that control of oil resources by the regions is not compatible with national reconciliation. On this point we reiterate our commitment to the Iraqi Constitution that has rendered a proper solution to this question and we reject attempts to alter this solution.
- 4) Recommendation 30 states the implementation of Article 140 of the Iraqi Constitution should be delayed. It further states that this issue should be placed on the agenda of the International Iraq Support Group (an international group the report seeks to create).

The Iraqi constitution defined the time and mechanism for implementing Article 140; a basic right of the Kurdish people. Any delay in the process of the implementation of Article 140 will have grave consequences and will in no way be accepted by the people of the Kurdistan Region.

- 5) The report argues for strengthening the central government and weakening the power of regions. This contradicts the constitution and the principle of federalism that forms the basis of the new Iraq. We reiterate that federalism is the only solution for maintaining the unity of Iraq.
- 6) In certain portions of the report the interests and concerns of neighboring countries have been taken into consideration, and the report argues that these nations should play a larger role in Iraq's future. This runs counter to the interests of the Iraqi people and especially the interests of the people of the Kurdistan Region – it amounts to interference in Iraq's internal affairs.
- 7) Recommendations 27 and 35 support rewarding those who opposed the political process in Iraq, by restoring them to government posts and power. This runs counter to the interests of the majority of the Iraqi people and the democratic process.
- 8) We offer our thanks to the President of the United States for bringing down the former regime and for his administration's role in building a new Iraq. The Iraq Study Group has offered unrealistic and unreasonable recommendations, in the hope of helping the US extricate itself from a difficult situation. If under this pretext the Iraq Study Group believes it can impose unreasonable recommendations on us,

6/13/2007

we, then, on behalf of the people of the Kurdistan Region, reject everything that is against the interests of Iraq and the Kurdistan Region.

9) The report contradicts the words of Mr. James Baker, who told us by phone that the special nature of the Kurdistan Region had been taken into consideration in the report. Although we communicated the Kurdistan Regional Government's perspective to the commission in a letter before the report was released, the commission ignored the letter and did not read it.

In closing, we state that we are in no way abiding by this report; we do not want the achievements of the political process in Iraq generally, and the Kurdistan Region specifically, to be marginalized, especially in the wake of elections and a constitutional referendum that was approved by 80 percent of the Iraqi people. Elections, we might add, that were supported by the international community and the United States.

Before others attempt to solve Iraqi problems, let Iraqis think about national reconciliation seriously. We call on all Iraqi groups who believe in the political and constitutional process and a federal and democratic Iraq, to take serious steps to solve our problems so that we can dispense with the deeply flawed recommendations of others.

Masoud Barzani
President of the Kurdistan Region
Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq
December 2006

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2007 11:01 AM
To: 'Letter from Erbil'
Subject: Letter by KRG Minister Falah Mustafa Bakir in New York Times Today

**New York Times
Letters
January 10, 2007**

To the Editor:

I strongly object to “Hundreds Disappear Into the Black Hole of the Kurdish Prison System in Iraq” (news article, Dec. 26).

The prisoners being held in these facilities are terrorists who have known affiliations with Al Qaeda, Ansar al-Islam and other groups committed to killing Americans, Kurds and Iraqis.

The rule of law is what guides our treatment of prisoners, whatever their crimes. The article even notes that the International Committee for the Red Cross regularly visits the inmates and is in contact with the Kurdish authorities.

There is no “intractable problem” accompanying Kurdish cooperation with the United States. The Kurds have displayed a historic and unparalleled commitment to a democratic Iraq. Nowhere else in the Middle East are Americans received with more warmth and appreciation than in the Kurdistan region.

The United States relationship with the Kurds of Iraq is a cornerstone for stability and democracy in Iraq and throughout the Middle East.

Falah Mustafa Bakir
Minister and Director of Office of Foreign Relations
Kurdistan Regional Government
Erbil, Iraq, Jan. 8, 2007

This letter can be found at: http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/10/opinion/10kurds.html?_r=1&oref=slogin

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2007 2:46 PM
To: 'LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net'
Subject: KRG statement: Status of Iraq federal oil law

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:18
CRN/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

KRG statement: Status of Iraq federal oil law

Erbil, 18 January 2006

In an article published by Reuters on 17th January headlined *Iraq leaders agree draft oil law*, a spokesman of the Ministry for Oil in Baghdad stated, "The committee finalized the draft of the law last night [i.e. 16th January]. It was approved unanimously and it will go before the cabinet early next week".

As far as the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) is concerned, the draft law has not been "finalized unanimously", therefore the claim made by the oil ministry spokesman, as reported by Reuters, is inaccurate and misleading.

The last draft that the KRG was in agreement with was presented to Prime Minister Al-Maliki for his review on 17th December 2006. That draft allows the KRG to negotiate and sign new contracts within the Region and to receive its fair share of Iraq's oil revenue, to be guaranteed and regulated by law. The draft acknowledges that the KRG shall be the competent authority to review its own previous contracts to make them consistent with the law. Any further material changes to that draft will require the KRG's consent.

Although the process of drafting the oil law is nearing completion, the important annexes to the law are still pending. Also, there are three associated laws (the revenue sharing law, the Iraq National Oil Company (INOC) charter law, and a law to define the oil ministry's new role) which must be drafted and agreed upon before the whole package can be regarded as being final.

Therefore, the position can only be finalized once all these matters are settled and the KRG looks forward to being among the first to make a formal announcement when this is done.

The Spokesman
Kurdistan Regional Government
Council of Ministers
Erbil, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

This letter can be found at: http://www.krg.org/articles/article_detail.asp?LangNr=12&LNNr=28&RNNr=70&ArticleNr=15832

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2007 9:59 AM
To: 'LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net'
Subject: Letter from KRG Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Letter from KRG Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

January 23, 2007

The Honorable Joseph Biden, Chairman
The Honorable Richard Lugar, Ranking Member
Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Dear Senator Biden and Senator Lugar,

I convey the greetings and friendship of the Kurdish people to the United States. I am following with great interest your important hearings on the situation in Iraq. The Kurdistan Regional Government of Iraq (KRG) has been a full partner with the United States and our fellow Iraqis in trying to build a democratic Iraq. We understand America's frustration with the situation in Iraq and we, too, are frustrated, disappointed and saddened by the continuing instability, violence and loss of life.

It is our deeply held view that the only viable long-term solution is a federal structure for Iraq that recognizes and empowers regional governments in the north, south, and center of the country. The Kurds are committed to a voluntary union within a federal system and have no plans to secede from Iraq.

A program for reconciliation in Iraq must offer a ground-breaking approach to both the decentralization of authority and the distribution of resources. In that context, I would like to take this opportunity to offer some clarification regarding the discussion of the Kurdish position on the Iraqi oil law that came up during Secretary Rice's appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday, January 11, 2007, and in subsequent press accounts of the negotiations over the law.

I have personally led the intensive negotiations about the Iraqi oil law in Baghdad on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG). The KRG has proposed a historic plan for the development of Iraqi oil resources and the distribution of oil revenues that is consistent with the interim Iraqi constitution, also known as the Transitional Administrative Law. In accordance with article 112 of the constitution, the federal government and the government of the oil producing regions will jointly manage production from existing fields. Regional governments have exclusive control over new fields, including the right to sign contracts with foreign companies. The law will follow article 142 of the constitution in recognizing as valid the contracts the KRG has signed with foreign oil companies.

There is agreement that oil revenues will be distributed to Iraq's Regions based on population, thus assuring the Sunni Arabs their proportionate share of oil wealth. And, while not constitutionally required to do so, the KRG has agreed that this sharing will include revenues from new fields as well as existing fields, including Kirkuk. Finally, the Kurdistan Regional Government will enact its own petroleum law to implement in our region what has been agreed with the federal government.

In order to assure transparency in contracting, the KRG will permit a newly created Federal Oil Council to audit all future contracts and to object to those that do not meet agreed standards.

As far as the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) is concerned, the oil law has not yet been finalized, although there have been recent statements and press accounts to the contrary. The last draft

6/13/2007

that the KRG was in agreement with was presented to Prime Minister Al-Maliki for his review on 17th December 2006, and the details of that draft is what I have described. Any further material changes to that draft will require the KRG's consent. Although the process of drafting the oil law is nearing completion, the important annexes to the law are still pending. Also, there are three associated laws (the revenue sharing law, the Iraq National Oil Company (INOC) charter law, and a law to define the oil ministry's new role) which must be drafted and agreed upon before the whole package can be regarded as being final.

Let me conclude with a word about Kirkuk. As you know, Saddam Hussein's regime carried out a brutal policy of "Arabization"--that is the forced migration of Kurds from Kirkuk, and Arabs to Kirkuk--to alter the Kurdish and demographic character of the city. Turcomen citizens also suffered under this policy. Although the consequences of Saddam's crimes are still with us, there will be a historic referendum in Kirkuk later this year. It should go without saying that the status of Kirkuk is a Kurdish and an Iraqi issue. It is not the business of any other country, including Turkey, which should not interfere in the affairs of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq.

I am personally committed to deepening Kurdish and Iraqi ties with Turkey, and my record speaks to that commitment. Turkish investment in, and trade with, the Kurdistan Region has been decisive in our economic stability and growth. An open and friendly border with Turkey is a top priority for the Kurds and for Iraq. However, we urge Turkey to avoid any statements or actions that could set back its relations with the KRG and further de-stabilize the situation in Iraq.

I hope this letter offers some clarification on the position of the Kurdistan Regional Government and that you would consider it for submission as part of the official record for your hearings on Iraq.

I plan to come to Washington in February and would welcome the opportunity to meet with you then. KRG Minister and Director of Foreign Relations Falah M. Bakir will soon visit Washington and will be available for consultations on the oil law or on any other questions you may have.

I would like to convey my personal invitation to you and your Senate colleagues to visit the Kurdistan Region of Iraq during your next visit to the region.

Sincerely yours,

Nechirvan Barzani
Prime Minister
Kurdistan Regional Government of Iraq
Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2007 4:24 PM
To: 'LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net'
Subject: KRG Statement: World Economic Forum selects Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani for Young Global Leaders 2007

KRG Statement: World Economic Forum selects Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani for Young Global Leaders 2007

January 18, 2007

The World Economic Forum announced that it has selected Kurdistan Regional Government Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani as one of its Young Global Leaders for 2007.

The international non-profit organization, which every year holds a meeting of business and political leaders in Davos, Switzerland, bestowed the honour on 250 young leaders from around the world for their professional accomplishments, their commitment to society and their potential to contribute to shaping the future of the world.

Read the full World Economic Forum press release below.

World Economic Forum announces Young Global Leaders for 2007

250 leading executives, public figures and intellectuals – all 40 or younger – chosen from around the world

Geneva, Switzerland, 16 January 2007 - The World Economic Forum released today the names of the 250 young leaders who have been selected Young Global Leaders 2007. This honour is bestowed each year by the World Economic Forum to recognize and acknowledge the top 250 young leaders from around the world for their professional accomplishments, their commitment to society and their potential to contribute to shaping the future of the world.

Drawn from a pool of over 4,000 candidates, the Young Global Leaders nominated in 2007 have been chosen by a selection committee of 34 eminent international media leaders, including Marjorie Scardino, Chief Executive, Pearson, United Kingdom; Arthur Sulzberger, Chairman and Publisher, The New York Times, USA; Tom Glocer, Chief Executive Officer, Reuters, United Kingdom; and Hisashi Hieda, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Fuji Television Network, Japan. The committee is chaired by Her Majesty Queen Rania of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

The Young Global Leaders 2007 include 125 business leaders, as well as leaders from governments, academia, media and society at large from nearly 70 countries. The new class represents all regions, including nominees from East Asia (50), Europe (50), Middle East and North Africa (25), North America (50), South Asia (30), sub-Saharan Africa (20) and Latin America (25). The current community of 416 Young Global Leaders represents 90 countries and includes Larry Page and Sergey Brin, co-founders of Google; Mikheil Saakashvili, President of Georgia; Kumi Naidoo, Secretary-General and Chief Executive Officer, Civicus: World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Daniela Mercury, Singer, Brazil; and Michelle Guthrie, Chief Executive Officer, Star Group.

“Confronting and tackling global challenges will require fresh, strategic thinking from global leaders, as well as innovative and truly international solutions based on global collaboration. This is why I created The Forum of Young Global Leaders – to be a voice for the future in global thought processes,” said Klaus Schwab, Executive Chairman of the World Economic Forum. “This unique global network has the potential to tackle global challenges through knowledge sharing and leveraging horizontal networks of collaborative platforms. Together, they form a powerful international force for the global common

6/13/2007

good.”

Established in 2004 by Professor Klaus Schwab, The Forum of Young Global Leaders is a unique, multistakeholder community of the world’s most extraordinary young leaders who dedicate a part of their time to jointly address global challenges and who are committed to devote part of their knowledge and energy to collectively work towards a better future. Together, they engage in the 2030 Initiative, a comprehensive endeavour, to understand current and future trends, risks and opportunities both at global and regional levels, formulate a positive vision for the world in 2030 and put forward concrete strategies and workstreams to translate their vision into action.

For more information and a detailed list of all Young Global Leaders, please visit www.younggloballeaders.org

This article can be found at: http://krg.org/articles/article_detail.asp?ArticleNr=15807&LangNr=12&LNNr=28&RNNr=70

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2007 2:56 PM

To: 'LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net'

Subject: KRG Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani: We must follow constitution timetable to solve Kirkuk

**Excerpts from Speech by Kurdistan Regional Government Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani
Kurdistan National Assembly
Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq
January 24, 2007**

Relationship between the Kurdistan Region and Turkey

"Our official relationship began with Turkey in 1991 during a refugee crisis that was addressed through mutually cooperation. While Turkey has occasionally taken a harsh disposition towards us, we have also successfully engaged each other with mutual respect.

"Since we have been responsible for the administration of the Kurdistan Region, we have not threatened or interfered in any way with the internal affairs of our neighbours, especially their security affairs. On the contrary, we have played a major role in promoting peace and contributing to their security. The Kurdistan Region has never threatened our neighbours. We have proven that we are not a violent or threatening government. In fact, we are a region where personal security and political stability prevails.

"After the fall of the regime of Saddam Hussein, the people of the Kurdistan Region have actively participated in rebuilding the new Iraq. From the outset, we have been trying to regain and establish our rights, which were taken from us by force by Saddam's regime. We seek to regain our rights legally in accordance with the constitution of Iraq, without creating internal conflict or using forceful means.

"Regarding Kirkuk, we shall adhere to the constitution approved by 80% of the Iraqi people to regain our rights as set out under Article 140. When Saddam Hussein's ruthless government fell, we could have taken control of Kirkuk easily by military means but we chose not to use aggressive methods favoured by the previous regime.

"Article 140 was enacted as a solution for Kirkuk and other Arabised areas. Article 140 is not just about the rights of Kurds, it is also about the rights of those from other backgrounds as well who suffered due to unjust actions by Saddam's regime when he destroyed villages and evicted innocent civilians from their homes."

The problems in Kirkuk

"The problems in Kirkuk and other Arabised parts of Iraqi Kurdistan are also apparent in Karbala, Najaf, and some places in Baghdad. In order to resolve these problems facing our country, we have to implement Article 140.

"Regarding recent threats from Turkey, we have to recognise there are two different views on this matter, one published in the Turkish media, and the official Turkish position. Some officials facing elections may have expressed their personal views. Iraq is an internally recognised sovereign and independent country with a constitution and government. If we think about this logically and wisely, neither Turkey nor any other country would send troops to Iraq without suffering militarily, economically, and politically in the international arena.

"Kirkuk is predominately Kurdish in culture and it represents the Kurdistan Region. But its people are

draft of the Federal Law recognises that regional administrations will have the power to award contracts in the region. The companion Revenue Sharing Law would allow revenues to be distributed to the KRG and all other regions and provinces of Iraq based on their populations, whether they have oil or not. We see this as a major step towards stability throughout Iraq.

12. What is the status of the draft Kurdistan Region Petroleum Act?

The draft Kurdistan Region Petroleum Act has been ready for some time. It will be slightly modified to be in harmony with the draft Federal Oil Law and the Revenue Sharing Law. It will go to the Kurdistan Parliament around the same time as the Federal Oil Law and Revenue Sharing Law are submitted to the Iraq Council of Representatives.

This KRG statement can be found at: www.krg.org.

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:18
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

US officials visit Kurdistan to promote Iraq's business gateway
March 5, 2007

Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq (KRG.org) - Paul Brinkley, US Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Business Transformation, on Thursday visited the Kurdistan Region with a delegation to explore ways to attract business to Kurdistan and other parts of Iraq.

Mr Brinkley visited Kurdistan 10 days after Frank Lavin, Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, came to the Region to promote business opportunities in Iraq.

Minister Falah Mustafa Bakir, Director of the Kurdistan Regional Government's (KRG) Office of Foreign Relations, said, "It was encouraging to see two delegations from the US and receive representatives of the Department of Defence, Department of State, universities, and the banking and construction sectors. This was a good opportunity for the KRG, the local business community and chamber of commerce to exchange views with the US delegation and the American Chamber of Commerce.

He added, "We value such initiatives and are confident that by working together we will be able to achieve positive results to help rebuild the Kurdistan Region and Iraq as a whole."

Mr Brinkley came to Kurdistan with over 50 officials, business representatives and experts in logistics, finance, engineering, petrochemicals, power generation, agriculture and factory management. The delegation met senior KRG officials including the ministers for Planning, Agriculture, Finance, Trade, Office of Foreign Relations, as well as the Head of the Investment Board, the Governor of Erbil and President of the University of Salahaddin. They visited the university, Erbil's ancient citadel, Qaisaria bazaar and the new Nishtiman shopping mall.

Ten days earlier, Under Secretary of Commerce Frank Lavin came to the Kurdistan Region to launch "Iraqi Business Gateways", a series of talks aimed at promoting private investment in Iraq. "All societies need job creation, business expansion, new opportunities," he said. "We think by working together and sharing ideas we can help Iraq down that path of economic growth and progress."

While the Kurdistan Region's economy has grown significantly since 2003, there is untapped potential in agriculture, tourism, construction and other sectors. Mr Lavin discussed with senior KRG and Iraqi officials how to highlight Kurdistan as the gateway for companies to expand to other parts of Iraq.

He met Deputy Prime Minister Omer Fattah, the ministers for Trade and for Planning, the Chairman of the Investment Board, the Director of the Office of Foreign Relations, other KRG and Iraqi government officials and the local business community.

This KRG statement can be found at: www.krg.org.

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

not only Kurds, they are also Turkmen, Arabs, Chaldeans, and Assyrians who live side by side with each other. We respect their views, and appreciate and honour them.

"Why is Kirkuk important to its people? It is not about the oil. We are a people deeply connected to our land. Kirkuk is about a dark history of its people. A people's relationship with their land is most precious. Retrieving property that was forcibly taken away is part of our honour.

"We are not just trying to win back the legitimate rights of Kurds, but also the rights of all those who were displaced from their homes by any means, violent or otherwise."

A solution for Kirkuk by peaceful and legal means

"If the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) were in charge of the situation in Kirkuk, we would not have witnessed the security problems we see there today. All the peoples of Kirkuk - regardless of their ethnic or religious background - would be safe and secure. We insist on the application of Article 140 because resolution of the problem has been excessively delayed. The constitution calls for a lawful resolution and a strict timeframe. I must also point out that were it not for the assistance of the KRG in security matters, the situation in Kirkuk would be worse.

"The Iraqi government favours the application of Article 140. We appreciate the support of the Iraqi government and of Prime Minister Al-Maliki, who has always expressed his support for the Iraqi constitution especially Article 140.

"We must work hand in hand with all the communities in Kirkuk, regardless of their background, to resolve its many problems. We do not want to turn from the persecuted into the persecutor. We want to achieve the normalisation of Kirkuk peacefully and legally."

Turkey and the Kurdistan Region have mutual interests

"Finally, I would like to stress that we want to have a good relationship with Turkey and we want them to feel the same about the Kurdistan Region in Iraq. The time for military invasions is very much over. We stand firm against any such action.

"We are confident that the Turkish government is aware of its interests; they have economic and political interests within the Kurdistan Region. Turkish companies have been contracting more than one billion US dollars worth of investments in our Region. This is an economic interest we would like to continue and strengthen over the coming years.

"The Kurdistan Region in Iraq will not tolerate any threats from any country."

The KRG press release can be found at: http://krg.org/articles/article_detail.asp?ArticleNr=16088&LangNr=12&LNNr=28&RNNr=70

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2007 10:12 AM
To: 'Letter from Erbil'
Subject: Kurdistan Regional Government Supports Draft Federal Oil Law

KRG Statement: Kurdistan Regional Government Supports Draft Federal Oil Law Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq February 26, 2007

Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq, (KRG) - On 24th February Mr Masoud Barzani, President of the Kurdistan Region, announced that an agreement had been reached with Iraq's Prime Minister Dr Nuri al-Maliki on the latest draft of the Federal Oil Law. Since this announcement, the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) has received many enquiries about this final agreement. Dr Ashti Hawrami, the KRG Minister for Natural Resources, offered the following explanations to the KRG Spokesman Dr Khaled Salih.

1. What is the substance of the agreement?

The essential terms of the agreement are as follows. The Kurdistan Region will voluntarily share some of its Constitutional powers to manage petroleum exploration and development in Kurdistan with the Federal Government. In particular, and in the interests of transparency, the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) will permit an independent panel of experts to review the KRG's petroleum contracts against certain agreed commercial criteria. The KRG will also voluntarily pool all of the petroleum revenues to which it is entitled with all the other regions and governorates. In return, Kurdistan will be guaranteed a share of pooled revenues proportionate to its population. The Kurdistan Regional Government will, of course, retain the power to sign contracts for petroleum exploration and development in the Kurdistan Region.

2. What does the agreement mean for Iraq and for the Kurdistan Region, and how optimistic are you that the draft law will be adopted by the Council of Representatives in Baghdad?

It is a great achievement for all of us in Iraq. We are confident that the remaining crucial oil law annexes and the Revenue Sharing Law will also be agreed upon soon in order to complete the process for the approval of the Council of Representatives. Most of the people I worked with are sincere and committed to complete the drafting process sooner rather than later. However, as you know, there are some individuals who still dream of maintaining central control over the management of the country's wealth and resources; they would like to delay or derail this process in order to keep Iraq unstable. Fortunately, they are in the minority, therefore I remain optimistic about the outcome.

3. What is the importance of the annexes and the Revenue Sharing Law?

The annexes provide for the allocation of specific territories and oil fields to the Iraq National Oil Company (INOC), the Oil Ministry and the KRG, as well as agreeing on model contracts and criteria for awarding contracts to ensure that all of Iraq, not just Kurdistan, is attracting new petroleum investment for the benefit of the whole country. These are, and have always been, a priority for the KRG.

The Revenue Sharing Law is an essential companion-piece to the Federal Oil Law, because it will guarantee to the Kurdistan Region, and all other parts of Iraq, their fair share of petroleum revenue according to population. It will also guarantee the viability of the Federal Government. The sharing of petroleum management powers by Regions cannot work if the federal government does not, in turn,

fairly share petroleum revenues. The Constitution of Iraq is very clear on this point, so the two laws will go to the Iraqi parliament as a package.

4. Was it the case, as some say, that the KRG were better organised by fully supporting your lead in the negotiations on behalf of the Kurdistan Region? Was it the case, as is widely rumoured, that you lately came under significant pressure to make concessions to Baghdad?

First of all I am pleased to hear that others felt that we were better organised, but that was primarily because we wanted to conduct the negotiation in a more businesslike fashion, to focus on the key issues that mattered to all concerned. The Iraq petroleum sector needs a common-sense approach. For the most part, the negotiations were going reasonably well, but some negotiators needed more time to understand the federal Constitution and the fundamental principles of sharing responsibilities and rights in a new Federal Iraq. Generally speaking, the committee worked as a team, but by the time we reached the final stages of the negotiations the process became more intense. New deadlines were imposed on us, without adequate time to agree on the Revenue Sharing Law and the important annexes to the oil law.

5. Why was the draft law rushed through without these annexes? Was it the case that you came under pressure to agree the basics, but to defer the details to a later date? What do you say about the rumours that attempts were made by the rest of the committee members to put more demands on the KRG by enlisting the support of US Embassy officials during the final stages of the negotiations?

Towards the end of last year, some deadlines appeared to be set to get the law done quickly. That did not leave the committee with any time to focus on the remaining important issues of the oil law annexes as well as the Revenue Sharing Law. Naturally, as the imposed deadline approached, the debate became more intense and more focused on the unresolved issues. Some senior US Embassy officials were brought in to assist with the process. Yes, we all had different opinions on how to proceed to the final stage. The KRG's concerns were very clear: we wanted to avoid having an incomplete law rushed through and we did not want to repeat the Constitution-drafting experience by putting form over substance. We were very much concerned that haste would be at a price of an incomplete drafting, that would likely lead to future internal conflicts and misunderstandings. We wanted to avoid creating uncertainties that would impact inward investment in the future. In that regard I am pleased to say that despite all the demands made from all quarters, including pressure from allies and colleagues within, we managed to persevere with our vision to get an agreement from all the parties that the remaining annexes and the revenue sharing law will also be agreed upon before submitting the whole package to the Council of Representatives.

6. Can you tell us about the existing contracts? What will happen to them?

There are five existing contracts. They were awarded before 2005. The contractors are DNO (Norwegian), Genel/Addax (Turkish/Canadian), WesternZagros (Canadian), PetPrime (Turkish/American), and A&T Energy (Turkish/American). These contracts have already been reviewed in the light of the draft Kurdistan Petroleum Act and modified where necessary to ensure that they meet the highest commercial standards. We do not envisage any further adjustments being necessary on these contracts; however we will consult the independent panel of experts appointed by the Federal Oil and Gas Committee, after its establishment under the Federal Oil Law, to ensure that they meet the Iraq-wide required standards. In the meantime, investment will continue under those contracts.

7. Can you disclose anything about the terms of these contracts? Can you also respond to those critics who imply the presence of irregularities in these contracts being the reason why the KRG has not so far been willing to disclose them to the Federal Authorities?

As you can appreciate, these are commercial contracts between two parties and it is unusual to publish these terms without the consent of the contractors involved. These contracts were specifically ratified by

Article 141 of the Constitution, but in the interests of transparency we will allow them to be reviewed by a panel of experts once appointed by the future Federal Oil and Gas Committee. There are no irregularities in any of these contracts that I am aware of. We have already reviewed and modified these contracts and are satisfied that they meet international standards, and I am also sure that they will also pass all the criteria and guidelines that Iraq might adopt under the Federal Oil Law. However, in the interest of full transparency, we have decided to compile all these agreements to be published in the near future on the KRG website for the Iraqi and international experts to see and comment on as they wish. I am quite sure that some commentators will see them as being amongst the toughest contracts even by today's high oil price and market conditions. As usual the KRG will lead the way in transparency and accountability.

8. Are there any more contracts in the pipeline and what would be the process for awarding new contracts in Kurdistan?

We have been negotiating with a number of parties, including large companies. For new contracts we will follow the forthcoming federal guidelines to invite competitive sealed bids on a number of exploration areas in the Kurdistan Region. This will be done through a bidding process, and we will not finalise any new contracts for a couple of months or so to allow the Federal Oil Law to be adopted by the Council of Representatives. All new contract negotiations will be carried out and awarded by the KRG. However, we will allow the Federal Oil and Gas Committee and its appointed independent panel of experts to review them to ensure that they meet the agreed federal guidelines, before final ratification by the KRG. We see this process as a positive element of our overall policy, as it will apply to all new contracts throughout Iraq. This will ensure that common standards are adhered to and maximum returns are achieved for the whole country.

9. If in two months time the law is not passed by the Council of Representatives in Baghdad, what would you do then?

Let us hope that this will not happen. If in a two months time the law is still under debate by the Council of Representatives, then we will be reasonable about it and maintain support for the process being completed. However, if the oil law is still facing difficulties and the annexes and the Revenue Sharing Law have not been agreed, then that would be unfortunate as we will be facing a new situation and we will have to review our options again.

10. It is not clear what would happen in the case of the disputed territories, would you able to elaborate any further on this issue?

The disputed territories, including Kirkuk, are dealt with in the draft Federal Oil Law. We have agreed on two things: that the Iraq National Oil Company (INOC) will continue to manage the current producing fields, including Kirkuk; and that no further activities will take place in these areas until the referendum process is completed. It should be noted that since we have now agreed to share revenues throughout Iraq, oil and gas will not feature in our discussions regarding the future of the disputed territories. For sure, this will make it easier for all concerned to understand that the referendum required by Article 140 of the Constitution is not about oil, but it is just about people, their homes and their preference for being within the Kurdistan Region or not.

11. Are you satisfied with the results and the contributions made by the KRG?

If we go strictly by the Iraq Constitution, the KRG is entitled to assume much greater powers over oil and gas. However, to make it work for all concerned, we had to be accommodating and pragmatic in our approach. I am pleased to say that almost all our ideas are now featured highly in the draft Federal Oil Law; indeed, the Federal Oil Law is modelled on the Kurdistan Region Petroleum Law. I am particularly pleased with the articles which call for the restructuring of the industry throughout Iraq in order to create greater accountability and transparency and to offer opportunities for inward investment. The current

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2007 1:55 PM
To: 'Letter from Erbil'
Subject: Kirkuk's Future

Letters, *Washington Times*, Wednesday, March 7, 2007, p. A18.

Kirkuk's Future

I write in response to the editorial "The Kirkuk referendum time bomb" (Monday) which argues against holding the referendum on Kirkuk according to the timetable and procedures described in the Iraqi constitution.

Article 140 of the Iraqi constitution calls for a lawful resolution and strict timeframe to address all disputed areas and Kirkuk's status, including a census and referendum to be held this year. It will be recalled that Saddam Hussein's regime systematically and brutally altered the Kurdish and demographic character of Kirkuk by forcibly displacing more than 120,000 Kurds, Turkmen and Christians from Kirkuk and replacing them with Arab Iraqis primarily from southern Iraq.

While other communities also suffered, Iraqi Kurds bore the disproportionate burden of suffering under Saddam's so-called Arabization campaign in Kirkuk. The process and referendum called for in the Iraqi constitution is an essential step in closing this terrible chapter from Saddam's era and in promoting reconciliation among all of Iraq's communities — Kurds, Arabs, Turkmen and Christians.

Regarding Kirkuk's oil reserves, which, as was noted in the editorial, accounts for approximately 8 percent of all of the oil reserves in Iraq: readers should know that the Kurdistan Regional Government has agreed in the draft Federal Oil Law soon to be submitted as a package to the Iraqi parliament that revenues from Kirkuk will be shared throughout Iraq.

Oil should therefore not figure in discussions regarding the future status of Kirkuk. The referendum has nothing to do with oil; it is about the preference of the people of Kirkuk either to live within the Kurdistan region of Iraq or not.

The editorial implies that a reason for delaying the referendum is intimidation and terrorism, including by al Qaeda affiliated terrorist groups, who have stepped up their murderous activities in Kirkuk and who seek to disrupt the transition to democracy and stability in the Kurdistan Region and throughout Iraq.

Let me say for the record that the Kurdistan Regional Government of Iraq will never give in to terrorism and stands as a full partner with the United States and the government of Iraq in defeating and bringing to justice those terrorists who kill Kurds, Iraqis and Americans.

With regard to the KRG's relations with Turkey, both Kurdistan Region's President Masoud Barzani and KRG Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani have repeatedly said that strengthening and deepening Kurdish and Iraqi ties with Turkey is a top priority of the Kurdistan Regional Government. The KRG welcomes the positive signals from Turkey and is ready to immediately begin direct, bilateral discussions with Turkey to look into all the outstanding issues.

The Kurdistan Regional Government of Iraq appreciates the support of the United States in respecting the Iraqi constitutional process on Kirkuk. In the interest of a stable, free and democratic Iraq, we ask

and anticipate Iraq's neighbors and all concerned parties to do the same.

Falah Mustafa Bakir
Director
Office of Foreign Relations
Kurdistan Regional Government of Iraq
Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq

This letter can also be found at: http://washingtontimes.com/op-ed/20070306-090342-4312r_page2.htm

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 5:38 PM
To: 'Letter from Erbil'
Subject: KRG publishes draft Federal Oil and Gas Law of Iraq in English and Arabic

KRG Statement: Kurdistan Regional Government publishes draft Federal Oil and Gas Law of Iraq in English and Arabic **Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq** **March 9, 2007**

Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq, (KRG) - The Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) Spokesman today published an authorised English translation of the draft Federal Oil and Gas Law for Iraq. The original Arabic draft, also published by the KRG today, was prepared by the Oil and Energy Committee of the Iraq Council of Ministers on 15 February 2007. That draft was later approved by the Council. The drafts can be downloaded at the links below.

The English translation published today was prepared and authorised by the KRG. "These are the drafts recognised by the KRG", said KRG Natural Resources Minister Dr. Ashti Hawrami. "Old and inaccurate translations of this vital draft law have been circulating in the media in recent weeks. By publishing the original Arabic and the authoritative English translation together, we hope to make the picture clearer for potential investors in Iraq." Dr. Hawrami represents the KRG on the Oil and Energy Committee.

Allocation of fields, model contracts, and Revenue Sharing Law outstanding

Pursuant to the Iraq Constitution and the draft law, the KRG will sign contracts for new fields in the Kurdistan Region. In a departure from the Iraq Constitution, the law establishes an independent advisory body, to be jointly appointed by the KRG and the Federal Government, to ensure that all contracts will meet certain minimum economic guidelines. The KRG has also voluntarily agreed that existing KRG petroleum contracts, which are explicitly validated by the Iraq Constitution, may also be reviewed by a panel of independent advisors.

The 15 February draft has not yet been introduced to the Iraq Council of Representatives (the Parliament), pending the completion of related matters. The Oil and Energy Committee will next prepare the four critical Annexes referred to in the draft Oil and Gas Law, which allocate the management of particular petroleum fields and exploration areas in Iraq to the KRG, the Iraq National Oil Company, and the Iraq Ministry of Oil. The Committee also needs to agree model petroleum contracts and guidelines for contractual terms, without which no investment in Iraq can begin. The Kurdistan Regional Government has agreed with the Federal Government that it will support the draft Federal Oil and Gas Law provided that the Annexes and other documents are concluded to the KRG's satisfaction, and if it is accompanied by an agreed Revenue Sharing Law for submission as a package to the Council of Representatives.

"The KRG has always been prepared to step down from its Constitutional rights and share petroleum management with the Federal Government", said Minister Hawrami. "But if we do so, we must make sure that the Federal Government, like Kurdistan, is doing all it can to attract new investment to Iraq. It is vital that the Federal Government adopt the same market-friendly approach that the KRG has been using in its contracts."

To download the draft law in English, [click here](#).

To download the draft law in Arabic, [click here](#).

6/13/2007

This KRG statement can be found at: www.krg.org.

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:18
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 6:10 PM
To: 'Letter from Erbil'
Subject: KRG Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani: Major Iraqi parties must honour constitutional responsibilities

**Speech by Kurdistan Regional Government Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani
Erbil, Kurdistan-Iraq
Thursday 22 March 2007**

Distinguished guests, good day, welcome and Happy Newroz to you all.

I wish to offer my warm greetings to Ambassador Khalilzad, the US Ambassador to Iraq, and Colonel Wolf of the US Army Corps of Engineers, and all those who have worked to bring this project to a successful completion.

It is important to take just a moment to offer special thanks to my dear friend Ambassador Khalilzad, who, as we know, is paying his last visit to the Kurdistan Region as US Ambassador to Iraq. We appreciate that as someone who cares for the people of Iraq you have worked sincerely for the establishment of a free and democratic Iraq. We do hope to see you from time to time in your new capacity as US Ambassador to the United Nations.

On behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government and the people of the Kurdistan Region, I want to thank you for the role you have played as ambassador to bring peace, stability and freedom to Iraq. I know you would have liked to achieve that vision before your departure, but all of us know how hard you have worked, with patience, great courage, and endurance. We in the Kurdistan Region count you as a close friend of Kurdistan and Iraq, and as someone who understands us well. We will miss you in Kurdistan and Iraq, and I wish you success in your new post.

You have played an important role in bringing the various Iraqi groups together and have a unique and successful style for solving problems. And, in addition to yesterday being the Newroz holiday, I understand it was also your birthday, so I wish you a most Happy Birthday Mr. Ambassador.

I am pleased and privileged to be here today to participate in the opening ceremony of the Ifraz water project. This project has great importance to the people of Erbil, the capital city in which nearly one million citizens now live.

According to our information, this water project is one of the largest American projects that has been successfully completed in Iraq, and this fact carries much significance for us all. We thank the United States government for this valuable contribution to the reconstruction of our country and of the service infrastructure of the Kurdistan Region.

I also thank the US Company Fluor for their management of the project and for their expertise and techniques.

I wish to thank the contractor and the team of engineers from the US Army Corps of Engineers and all of the local labourers, staff, technicians, engineers and supervisors who have carried out their duties in a good spirit. This project is a testament to your skills, hard work, and determination to succeed.

The Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) has provided full support and facilitation to implement this project from the beginning of the work. I wish also to thank the Zozik Company for their contribution. I

6/13/2007

would like to thank the Minister for Municipalities and her entire staff and all other relevant departments of the KRG for their work and commitment.

Now that the first phase of the project is completed, it will play an outstanding role in solving the water shortage problems in Erbil. Implementing the second phase of the project, which is a supplement to this work, will help solve the entire problem of water for the city.

We also need to make efforts to control the distribution network, and to reduce the waste of water which is a precious resource in today's world. The media, Ministry of Education, and other ministries can play a role in educating people on the correct usage of water to conserve this resource.

The fact that the Kurdistan Region is stable and secure is not an accident. This security and stability has come as a result of the continuous effort of the KRG with the full support of our people and the steadfast efforts of our brave security, police, and Peshmergha forces.

The KRG recognizes its duties and responsibilities to the people of the Kurdistan Region, and we continue our efforts to improve the basic services for our people. It is the peoples' natural right to be served by their government.

In the past few years, despite various obstacles, the KRG has tried seriously to strengthen the judicial system in the Region and develop the law enforcement authorities.

To provide basic services and to secure a prosperous life, we continue to develop a system of good governance, transparency and full accountability in implementing our duties.

From the uprising of 1991 to the liberation of Iraq in 2003, we faced great difficulties. The fall of the regime and the establishment of a new federal and democratic Iraq were highly valued and anticipated. We pay tribute to all those who sacrificed their lives, especially the US military, in the liberation of Iraq. We are committed to our position, and we want to be part of a stable, secure and peaceful Iraq. However, in return for this attitude and commitment we see it as our right to have our just demands fulfilled.

We proudly and successfully participated in drafting a civilized and modern constitution that includes the minimum level of demands for our rights, and the people of Iraq voted for it.

Today, four years after the fall of the regime and the liberation of Iraq, we believe that many of the agreements that were reached have not all been implemented fully. Our people are patient and principled, but our patience is not unlimited; they have concerns and they are asking for increased services and programs from their government.

Every day that passes without solving these issues makes it more difficult to explain to our people why we are committed to this agreement. We need the major parties in Iraq to honour their responsibilities under the constitution that was voted for by the people of Iraq. Without this, we cannot build a better life for our people.

We have asked for four basic conditions in return for our support for a democratic, federal, pluralistic Iraq.

1. We have asked for our fair and just share of revenues of Iraq to be allocated to our region.
2. We have asked that the issue of Kirkuk and other disputed areas be resolved in a timely and peaceful democratic manner.
- 3 We have asked to be given the freedom and opportunity to develop our region economically and politically.

4. We have asked for a fair and just share of reconstruction funds.

Our question is this: Have these four demands been implemented?

It is our right to receive our fair and just share of revenues from the centre on a timely basis, and to have full confidence in the budgetary support which is to be provided by the federal government in Baghdad. As a full constitutional partner in rebuilding the new Iraq, we need to have a complete explanation and transparency in the budgetary process.

On the issue of Kirkuk and other disputed areas, the situation is still as it was, and has worsened and not improved. This comes at a time while we were assured that Article 140 in the constitution would be implemented. The Article 140 process is an important part of building a federal democratic Iraq. The items and provisions are obvious and clear. The people of Kirkuk and other disputed areas must be allowed to decide their fate for themselves. The process is easy and must include normalization of the situation, conducting a census, and holding a referendum before the end of the year where people can freely make their decision. What was taken from us by force must be returned peacefully and democratically.

My question is this – why have we not seen more progress in this process?

As we have said before, every day that passes without solving the issue of Kirkuk, Sinjar, Sheikham, Makhmour, and other disputed areas makes the problems more complicated and more difficult. It is important for all to understand that this problem will not solve itself if left to time. Article 140 is clear, the way ahead is obvious, and the time to solve the problem is now.

We have to be given opportunities to re-habilitate our economy and re-build our infrastructure in a free and effective way in accordance with the constitution. This could be done if we enjoyed full cooperation and support from Baghdad. Two main areas are oil and electricity. We see that remaining as part of federal Iraq instead of leading to progress and more services, sometimes causes problems.

Regarding oil, the constitution of Iraq allows for regional governments to develop their oil resources, provided that necessary mechanisms are established for revenue sharing. The oil projects in Zakho and Taq Taq provide great hopes for our people for a secure and prosperous future. These projects are fully consistent with the key principles of our agreements, and within the framework of our constitutional rights. I take note of the role of Ambassador Khalilzad in these discussions, and thank him for his positive contributions to the negotiations. He was able to help in an efficient and effective manner. We are pleased that recently we have been able to reach an agreement on the final draft of the oil law and other laws. We believe that these laws, together with their annexes, should be submitted to the Parliament as whole package and at that time, many of the problems will be solved.

There is another subject that I wanted to raise regarding allocation of US, coalition, and donor countries' reconstruction funds. I do not wish to criticize, simply to put forward reasonable and just requests for our Region. Last year when you were here for the Erbil International Trade Fair you referred to the progress that has been made, and you commended the stability and security that the Kurdistan Region has achieved. Your words encouraged us more and we thank you for your efforts in bringing business people and investors, to our region, as part of Iraq, and a future gateway to the rest of Iraq.

We thank the US government for its support. With your assistance, recently we are feeling that the US is focusing more attention on the Kurdistan Region through sending high level delegations, business, universities, etc. and also the Regional Reconstruction Team and USAID. We appreciate and value these efforts in the Kurdistan Region.

We have serious problems in this region. We have many desperate needs. Alone, and with the current limited budget that has been allocated to us, we will never be able to rebuild a nation that has been

destroyed in the past.

We want national and foreign companies and investors to come here and carry out serious projects. We are aiming at big strategic projects of service infrastructure that we cannot carry out alone.

We have an interest in the success of Iraq. Our vision for a stable and prosperous region is tied to a stable, prosperous, and secure Iraq. We support the efforts of President Bush and the government in Baghdad to bring security and stability to Iraq.

Solving these problems is in the interests of all concerned, and will be in the interest of a federal and democratic Iraq.

Once again I welcome you all, thank you for your participation. Thank you.

This transcript can be found at: www.krg.org.

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:19
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2007 3:14 PM
To: 'Letter from Erbil'
Subject: KRG Prime Minister Barzani urges peaceful solution for Kirkuk

"Barzani urges peaceful solution for Kirkuk"

The Kurdish Globe

May 2, 2007

PM Barzani calls upon Iraqis to unite in the face of terrorism.

Kurdistan Region's Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani said that his government wants to retain Kirkuk peacefully, and urged Turkey to respect "the will of the Iraqi people," warning of the consequences of military action by the Turkish army inside Kurdistan Region's territory.

While speaking to the pan-Arab al-Sharaq al-Awsat newspaper, Prime Minister Barzani said, "We reiterate that Kirkuk is an Iraqi city with a Kurdistan identity and we have a roadmap to resolve this issue," referring to Article 140 of the Iraqi constitution.

"Our slogan is that we want to rectify what has been forcefully done to Kirkuk and return Kirkuk to its natural position according to the Iraqi constitution and law in a peaceful way," said Barzani in an interview that was published last Saturday.

Article 140 of the Iraqi constitution has laid out three major steps to resolve the dispute over the fate of Kirkuk. The first step is the return of Kurdish and Turkoman refugees to Kirkuk and the compensation of Arab settlers, brought to the city by Saddam Hussein's regime, who go back to their original areas in the southern and central parts of the country. The other two steps include a census to determine the population of the oil-rich province of Kirkuk to be followed by a referendum scheduled for the end of this year on whether Kirkuk should be part of Kurdistan or not.

Asked if his government would resort to military force to retain Kirkuk should the constitutional process fail, Barzani responded, "We don't want to and don't like to discuss this issue in this way. The important thing here is that there is a problem, and if one of the parties thinks that by taking the benefit of time and delaying the steps (of resolving the issue) the problem will be forgotten, then it is wrong. Any delay in resolving that issue will further deepen it and delaying it for any single day will further complicate the matter."

In response to a question on the Turkish statements over Kirkuk, Barzani said, "In fact, Turkey is interfering too much in this issue. We say that Turkey needs to respect the will of the Iraqi people. There is a constitution for which 80% of Iraqi people have voted under difficult circumstances. This issue (of Kirkuk) has to do with the Iraqi people and Turkey doesn't have any rights to interfere in it."

He added that the responsibility to deal with Turkey regarding the Kirkuk issue lies with the Iraqi government.

Despite increasing Turkish threats over the past few months to launch a military incursion onto Kurdistan Region's soil, Barzani said he doesn't expect a Turkish invasion, adding, "Turkey knows its interests."

However, Barzani said he still expects a limited small-scale Turkish operation in the remote mountainous areas against the fighters of the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), but not a large-scale

6/13/2007

military incursion deep into Kurdistan's soil.

"Turkey knows that a large-scale military intervention serves neither its interests nor ours, so then why should it do such a military intervention," he stated.

Regarding the current violence in Iraq, Barzani said, "The problems and challenges that Iraq is facing today are so huge and deep and difficult; Iraq is suffering from terror and regional intervention."

He warned that the continuation of the present chaotic situation in Iraq would harm all components of Iraqi society, saying, "In this war no one is a winner; all will be losers. Kurds, Shias and Sunnis are all responsible before history because we have had chances for success and we still do."

This article can be found at: <http://www.kurdishglobe.net/displayArticle.jsp?id=9D471CB70D0685771D9A0C51AC5A7D06>.

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Letter from Erbil

From: Letter from Erbil [LetterFromErbil@kurdistantoday.net]
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2007 3:14 PM
To: 'Letter from Erbil'
Subject: KRG Prime Minister Barzani urges peaceful solution for Kirkuk

"Barzani urges peaceful solution for Kirkuk"

The Kurdish Globe
May 2, 2007

PM Barzani calls upon Iraqis to unite in the face of terrorism.

Kurdistan Region's Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani said that his government wants to retain Kirkuk peacefully, and urged Turkey to respect "the will of the Iraqi people," warning of the consequences of military action by the Turkish army inside Kurdistan Region's territory.

While speaking to the pan-Arab al-Sharaq al-Awsat newspaper, Prime Minister Barzani said, "We reiterate that Kirkuk is an Iraqi city with a Kurdistan identity and we have a roadmap to resolve this issue," referring to Article 140 of the Iraqi constitution.

"Our slogan is that we want to rectify what has been forcefully done to Kirkuk and return Kirkuk to its natural position according to the Iraqi constitution and law in a peaceful way," said Barzani in an interview that was published last Saturday.

Article 140 of the Iraqi constitution has laid out three major steps to resolve the dispute over the fate of Kirkuk. The first step is the return of Kurdish and Turkoman refugees to Kirkuk and the compensation of Arab settlers, brought to the city by Saddam Hussein's regime, who go back to their original areas in the southern and central parts of the country. The other two steps include a census to determine the population of the oil-rich province of Kirkuk to be followed by a referendum scheduled for the end of this year on whether Kirkuk should be part of Kurdistan or not.

Asked if his government would resort to military force to retain Kirkuk should the constitutional process fail, Barzani responded, "We don't want to and don't like to discuss this issue in this way. The important thing here is that there is a problem, and if one of the parties thinks that by taking the benefit of time and delaying the steps (of resolving the issue) the problem will be forgotten, then it is wrong. Any delay in resolving that issue will further deepen it and delaying it for any single day will further complicate the matter."

In response to a question on the Turkish statements over Kirkuk, Barzani said, "In fact, Turkey is interfering too much in this issue. We say that Turkey needs to respect the will of the Iraqi people. There is a constitution for which 80% of Iraqi people have voted under difficult circumstances. This issue (of Kirkuk) has to do with the Iraqi people and Turkey doesn't have any rights to interfere in it."

He added that the responsibility to deal with Turkey regarding the Kirkuk issue lies with the Iraqi government.

Despite increasing Turkish threats over the past few months to launch a military incursion onto Kurdistan Region's soil, Barzani said he doesn't expect a Turkish invasion, adding, "Turkey knows its interests."

However, Barzani said he still expects a limited small-scale Turkish operation in the remote mountainous areas against the fighters of the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), but not a large-scale

military incursion deep into Kurdistan's soil.

"Turkey knows that a large-scale military intervention serves neither its interests nor ours, so then why should it do such a military intervention," he stated.

Regarding the current violence in Iraq, Barzani said, "The problems and challenges that Iraq is facing today are so huge and deep and difficult; Iraq is suffering from terror and regional intervention."

He warned that the continuation of the present chaotic situation in Iraq would harm all components of Iraqi society, saying, "In this war no one is a winner; all will be losers. Kurds, Shias and Sunnis are all responsible before history because we have had chances for success and we still do."

This article can be found at: <http://www.kurdishglobe.net/displayArticle.jsp?id=9D471CB70D0685771D9A0C51AC5A7D06>.

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC, has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Kurdistan Regional Government. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]

Sent: Friday, December 01, 2006 3:09 PM

Subject: Balkan Update: Serbia Offered Membership in NATO's Partnership for Peace

Balkan Update: Serbia Offered Membership in NATO's Partnership for Peace

Please find below two press releases from the Government of Serbia regarding NATO's decision on November 29 allowing Serbia to join NATO's Partnership for Peace.

Contents

- 1) **Serbia in Partnership for Peace**
(Government of Serbia)
- 2) **Serbia's membership in Partnership for Peace will keep its territorial unity**
(Government of Serbia)

1) Serbia in Partnership for Peace

Government of Serbia Press Release

Riga/Belgrade, Nov 29, 2006 – Serbia was given the green light today in Riga by NATO Heads of State to join the Partnership for Peace programme. Membership for Serbia, according to the final document from the NATO summit, is not formally conditional.

It is stated in the document that NATO Heads of State have brought this decision keeping in view the long term stability of the Balkans and the progress made thus far.

Besides Serbia, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina were called upon to join the NATO programme, whose membership is also not formally conditional.

2) Serbia's membership in Partnership for Peace will keep its territorial unity

Government of Serbia Press Release

Bogdanje, Nov 29, 2006 - Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica said today that Serbia's membership in the Partnership for Peace will keep the wholeness of its territory and that Kosovo-Metohija will remain part of Serbia, with an appropriate substantial autonomy.

Kostunica told reporters in Bogdanje near Trstenik that Serbia's entry into the Partnership for Peace is a very important and encouraging fact at the moment when we are fighting to keep Serbia's integrity.

Serbia's entry into the Partnership for Peace is also important because it shows that the process of European integration continues and that every attempt to set conditions for it is wrong.

He recalled that Serbia submitted a formal application for membership in spring 2002. He explained that the membership in the Partnership for Peace enables various forms of military cooperation and cooperation with the NATO.

The Prime Minister voiced hope that the membership in the Partnership for Peace will influence other negotiations that are ahead of Serbia and its struggle for Kosovo-Metohija.

In Bogdanje Kostunica delivered keys for 12 houses to families whose homes were destroyed during a large-scale landslide that hit the surroundings of Trstenik this spring.

Apart from the Prime Minister, the delegation that visits Bogdanj and Trstenik also includes ministers of capital investment Velimir Ilic and economy Predrag Bubalo.

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:19
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]

Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2006 4:44 PM

Subject: Balkan Update: Dr. Sanda Raskovic-Ivic speaks at UN Security Council Meeting on Kosovo

Balkan Update

**Speech by Dr. Sanda Raskovic-Ivic
President of the Coordinating Centre for Kosovo-Metohija for the Government of Serbia
UN Security Council Meeting on Kosovo
December 13, 2006**

"At the outset, I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of December. It gives me particular pleasure today to address this body of the world Organization.

Proceeding from a notion that we all share — that the establishment of lasting peace and security is the goal to which all people of goodwill are committed —

I would particularly like to emphasize the important role of the Security Council concerning Kosovo and Metohija. Its importance is especially great since many sovereign States view the recent developments in the western Balkans with increasing alarm, owing to certain unrealistic assessments with regard to the future status of Kosovo and Metohija.

Serbia is fully prepared to assume its share of responsibility in the process of successfully resolving of the question of Kosovo and Metohija, on the basis of international law and in line with universally acclaimed democratic values. We are fully confident that the Security Council will make a crucial contribution in the spirit of its previous documents, primarily resolution 1244 (1999) of 10 June 1999, which unambiguously reaffirms the sovereignty and territorial integrity of our country.

It is absolutely clear that only by the systematic, responsible and gradual management of the negotiations on the future status of Kosovo and Metohija will we be able to reach a long-term sustainable solution. Such a solution cannot be achieved in haste and should emerge only through confidence-building, dialogue and negotiations. Otherwise, new complications may arise. Confidence and dialogue are conditions sine qua non for any coexistence. Nervousness, haste and arrogance will not help. They will only drive us further from a solution. We have a saying: "Avoid shortcuts — they might be the wrong way".

However, I must regrettably inform the Council about the cruel reality in Kosovo and Metohija, which testifies to the lack of freedom and security there. From 15 August to 1 December 2006, 75 ethnically motivated attacks were committed, in which 23 persons of Serb nationality were injured. The extremists also targeted members of other communities. The house of Zecir Zurapi, a member of the ethnic Gorany community in the village of Gornja Rapca, was blown up on 1 October 2006. The perpetrators of that terrorist act, like so many others in the past, have not been identified. It is significant, however, that immediately before the attack, Zurapi was involved in plans to have the Gorany students educated in line with the Serbian curriculum. As a result, more than 1,000 students in three schools were not able to attend classes for more than 30 days.

Over the same period, in the territory of Kosovo and Metohija, 17 transmitter stations belonging to the Serbian mobile operator Telekom Srbija were put out of operation. This is a virtual criminal act that is taking place before the very eyes of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), because, since 1997, Telekom Srbija has had a valid licence to operate throughout the entire

territory of Serbia, and has paid all of its taxes to UNMIK and the Kosovo Provisional Government. That act has further isolated the Serbian population. It should also be pointed out that, in the context of all types of communications, UNMIK has consistently tried, to varying degrees, to extend its mandate, thus violating the sovereignty of Serbia. There are many examples of that in its activities related to the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Union of Railways, the International Committee for Railway Transport, the Universal Postal Union and the International Telecommunication Union. All of those activities are aimed at taking away attributes and symbols through international specialized organizations, thus prejudging the final status of Kosovo and Metohija. In that way, preconditions for cooperation and confidence are naturally further undermined.

Furthermore, there have been drastic and selective electricity cuts. Such discrimination reached its apogee in the Serbian communities of central Kosovo and the municipality of Strpce, where one hour of power supply is followed by 10 to 20 hours of blackouts. Add to that the fact that there have been 260 inter-ethnic incidents since 24 October 2005, in which all the victims were Serbs, and the trend becomes more than obvious.

Let me add another sombre detail: even with the assistance of UNMIK, we have not been able to make the Albanian side agree — at least at a declaratory level — to the need to rebuild the houses of Serbs from Badovac village who were expelled in the riots of March 2004. At that time, Serbian houses all over Kosovo were set on fire and destroyed. People were expelled, and some were killed.

As for the return of expelled and internally displaced persons, I would like to recall that, from 1999 to date, as many as 250,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) have not been in a position to return to Kosovo and Metohija. According to our data, 2 per cent have returned; according to UNMIK, the figure is 5 per cent. Major demographic and migratory shifts have taken place in Kosovo and Metohija. The population in Pristina, the capital, has increased threefold, and it is currently estimated at 600,000. There are no more than some 100 Serbs in Pristina. Before 1999, there were about 40,000 Serbs in Pristina.

As far as Serbian religious monuments, cultural heritage and religious freedoms are concerned, Albanians pay lip service to their protection. Serbian shrines are in fact looted and desecrated on a daily basis. The church of the Holy Shroud in the village of Babin Most near Obilic and the church of Saint Petka in Gojbulja, in the municipality of Vucitrn, were broken into and ransacked. The orchards of the Devic monastery, in the village of Lausa in the municipality of Srbica, were completely destroyed, even though they were guarded by KFOR and the Kosovo Protection Service police after having been set on fire in March 2004.

Illegal construction close to cultural sites within the proposed protected zones is rampant. At the end of September, large-scale construction was begun in the vicinity of the monument honouring the mediaeval Serbian Kosovo heroes in Gazimestan, near Pristina. During the same period, in the neighbourhood of the village of Velika Hoca — a village that has 13 churches dating from the twelfth to the fifteenth century — an industrial facility is being built. There are plans to build a large hotel close to Gorioč monastery. These so-called construction activities naturally give rise to serious concern, since they are being carried out in close proximity to religious and cultural sites, which, in the negotiations on the future status of the province, should be granted the status of protected zones where urbanization and industrial construction are not allowed.

Those activities are obviously a deliberate attempt to prevent the preservation of the cultural and environmental integrity of the sites. The Government of Serbia and all the members of the Contact Group are insisting on that, making the negotiations on cultural heritage one of their priorities.

It should also be pointed out that attempts are being made by the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government to revise history and to delete all traces of Serb existence in Kosovo and Metohija. One of the most flagrant instances of quasi-historical propaganda by the provisional Ministry of Culture of Kosovo took place in May 2005 in Paris. The Minister of Culture, Astrit Haracia, tried to distribute in the UNESCO building a pamphlet entitled Monuments of Kosova. The publication makes no mention

whatsoever of the Serbian contribution to the heritage of Kosovo and Metohija. That publication outraged the participants and UNESCO officials. Its distribution was stopped by Søren Jessen-Petersen, who was head of UNMIK at the time, at the explicit request of our Minister for Foreign Affairs. Regrettably, the Provisional Ministry of Culture of Kosovo, even after that unfortunate incident a year and a half ago, has continued to promote more or less the same ideas in a different form. On its web site, www.visitkosova.org, a one-sided historical version is presented stating that Kosovo and Metohija has been exclusively the land of the Albanians since earliest history.

The role of UNMIK is, unfortunately, giving rise to concern. Although it is unambiguously defined in all documents as a United Nations transitional administration with a clear mandate, it often assumes the role of a condominium by seeking to create a State for Albanians. Almost as a rule, UNMIK has adopted a sympathetic attitude and ignored Albanian extremism.

I would like to recall that Ambassador Kai Eide, in his comprehensive review of the situation in Kosovo, emphasized that, along with the process of seeking a solution concerning the future status of Kosovo and Metohija, it is crucially important to continue with the standards implementation as the only way forward. Ambassador Eide also pointed out other very important and substantial problems.

Unfortunately, for the time being, there are no serious signs that anyone is willing to recognize at least some of those perfectly adequate and constructive recommendations. The Special Envoy of the Secretary-General, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, said a fortnight ago that compromise was impossible and stupid. That statement cast a shadow on the constructive efforts being made, especially given that compromise is one of the important principles endorsed by the Contact Group at its meeting in January 2006.

Anyone can see that organized crime, human trafficking and corruption are rampant in Kosovo and Metohija. The drug and arms trade and smuggling provide a lifeline for the criminal and terrorist business, before the very eyes of the international community, the police and the military. Mafia-style Albanian clans are currently flourishing. The most recent and alarming incident occurred 10 days ago, when an Albanian terrorist paramilitary formation in Kosovo and Metohija began to intercept vehicles, asking for identification papers and intimidating passengers. Also, several days ago, on 8 December, barely a few minutes before a train was scheduled to arrive, unidentified terrorists blew up railway tracks in the vicinity of Mijalic village, in the municipality of Vucitrn. The only passengers in the train were Serbs, who travel regularly from Priluzje, Plemetine and Zvecan on this line. The blowing up of the tracks was yet another horrific terrorist attack against the Serbs.

Difficult as it may be, the situation and the events in Kosovo and Metohija should be looked at in a realistic, responsible and objective fashion. Any precipitous solution would cost the region, the province itself and the international community dearly; instead of achieving a sustainable solution, they would have to deal with an even more difficult and complex situation in Kosovo and Metohija. A hasty solution would set a precedent that would open up a Pandora's box.

I must emphasize once again here that the entire strategy adopted by the Albanian side in the past actually boils down to not engaging in the status negotiations. The Kosovo Albanians are idly waiting to be given yet another Albanian State in the Balkans within the internationally recognized borders of Serbia. From the point of view of the interests of the international community at large, such an outcome is unacceptable; we cannot but take into account the facts.

I would like to stress that the solution has to be a compromise reached in the interests of peace and lasting stability. It has to be sought, on an agreed basis, by the two negotiating parties — Serbian and Albanian. Belgrade, the Government of Serbia and the Serbs of Kosovo in particular are seeking to reach an agreement that guarantees a durable solution with respect to their coexistence in a modern, democratic and decentralized State.

The Serbian side therefore sees the solution to the Kosovo problem as based on the implementation of the principles and specific solutions contained in the platform of the Serbian negotiating team on the future status of Kosovo and Metohija. It remains the best way to resolve the current horrific situation in the province. A different outcome would create unlawfulness, and unlawfulness breeds more unlawfulness.

The international community should support, and demonstrate such support by its deeds, its commitment to a stable and safe region. That can be achieved only by taking steps to introduce the rule of law, punish criminals and terrorists, and create the security and other conditions necessary to a normal and dignified life. A life of dignity is not only defined by the fundamental documents of international law, but is also embodied in European standards recognizing the respect of human rights and freedoms.

Of course, my country relies primarily on the law — domestic law, international law, democratic principles, agreements and treaties — but first and foremost on the inviolable principle of justice. We firmly believe that there is a way out of this situation. A sustainable solution can be based only on giving up extreme demands and embracing a rational approach and compromise. In practice, that means substantial autonomy for Kosovo — the kind of autonomy that no European or other State has granted to their region so far. It is there that, despite the obvious difficulties, there is manoeuvring space for agreement and compromise. There is manoeuvring space to find a solution. The talks held so far have not borne fruit, largely due to the lack of engagement and the insufficient number of meetings. We propose that the Vienna talks be immediately resumed in order to define modalities for the broadest possible autonomy of Kosovo Albanians in Kosovo and Metohija, with the participation of the European Union. The talks should be intensive so as to enable us to obtain results soon.

The threat of violence that is being heard more or less openly from the Albanian side cannot be accepted as a rational argument. Perhaps today violence is a consequence of a conjuncture, but a conjuncture is a variable. Constants are always better than variables, and, in this instance, a constant means dialogue, compromise and rejection of the use of violence.

Serbia voiced its position on Kosovo and Metohija just a month and a half ago in a fully legitimate and very powerful fashion. More than half of registered voters with the right to vote opted in favour of the new Constitution of Serbia. Its preamble incorporates the fundamental principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and Security Council resolution 1244 (1999). That constitutional provision has been practically based on the Charter of the United Nations, on which this body which I have the honour to address today is also based. By adopting the Constitution of their country in a referendum, an absolute majority of the citizens of Serbia reaffirmed their commitment to the principle of the inviolability of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of democratic States and to the inviolability of the borders of the Republic of Serbia, and thus to the United Nations and the Security Council."

Transcript can be found at:

<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/657/31/PDF/N0665731.pdf?OpenElement>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2006 11:21 AM
Subject: Balkan Update

Balkan Update:

- 1) Serbia joins PfP program**
Government of Serbia Press Release
- 2) Serbia sees regional cooperation as priority**
Government of Serbia Press Release
- 3) Kostunica to sign in CEFTA today**
Government of Serbia Press Release
- 4) Strategy for improvement of living conditions of Serbs in Kosovo presented**
Government of Serbia Press Release

1) Serbia joins PfP programme Government of Serbia Press Release

Brussels, Dec 14, 2006 – Serbian President Boris Tadic, who was authorised by the Serbian government, signed today in NATO's headquarters in Brussels a framework agreement enabling Serbia to become a full member of NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme, which makes Serbia 23rd member of this programme.

Tadic signed the document in a meeting of the North Atlantic Council presided over by NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer.

Article can be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=30071&q=pfp>

2) Serbia sees regional cooperation as priority

Government of Serbia Press Release

Bucharest/Belgrade, Dec 19, 2006 – Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica said at the CEFTA summit in Bucharest that Serbia looks upon regional cooperation as its priority in economic relations and that it represents a key component of a faster European integration process as well as of integration into global trade with the rest of the world.

The official website of the Serbian government brings address of Vojislav Kostunica in full.

“Mr. Chairman,
Excellencies,

Ladies and gentlemen,

I take this opportunity to greet you on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Serbia and to express my pleasure in participating in the deliberations at today's meeting which, measured by any standards, represents an important turning point in the relations in the region.

Slightly more than eight months have elapsed since the Bucharest meeting was held where we initiated negotiations for the conclusion of the CEFTA 2006 Agreement, and we have come to the same venue today in order to finally affix our signatures to this instrument. The resolve on the part of all the participants to have the negotiations completed within a fairly short period, as well as the expected maximum level of flexibility, clearly indicate that the entire region is committed to further promoting mutual cooperation in a more comprehensive and intensive way. I wish to point out that the international community's assistance and particularly that of the representatives of the European Commission and the Stability Pact for South-East Europe, under whose auspices the entire negotiation process evolved, has contributed to its effective completion.

It is also my pleasant obligation to once again say thank you to the Government of Romania for the extremely successful organization of the conference and the cordial hospitality extended to us all.

I wish to stress that Serbia looks upon regional cooperation as its priority in economic relations. At the same time, this regional cooperation is a key component of a faster European integration process as well as of integration into global trade with the rest of the world. The Agreement which we are about to sign will contribute to harmonization, transparency, stability and predictability of the terms of trade in the region, which is also a prerequisite for generating keener interest among investors outside the region. It is important that the Agreement also covers new fields in which more favourable terms for cooperation will be gradually provided, primarily in the sphere of services, intellectual property, competition, investments and public procurement.

It is equally important that our Agreement stipulates the setting up of a Secretariat whereby a convenient institutional framework will be put in place for management and monitoring of the effective implementation of its provisions.

This is the second time since May 2004 that we are able to see to what extent membership of CEFTA lays the groundwork for full EU membership: this is borne out by Bulgaria's and Romania's entry into the Club of the Twenty-Five which will take place in 10 days' time or so. I am convinced that the Agreement will secure favourable conditions for the development and diversification of mutual trade, create new job opportunities, more competition, ensure more significant practical use of expertise, research findings and scientific advances and, consequently, result in growth of prosperity and stability in the region. I likewise hold that it is very important to secure a higher level of freedom of movement for people through visa facilitation both within the region and throughout the EU.

I take this opportunity to inform you that the overall political, economic, legislative and administrative framework for doing business in the Republic of Serbia is being systematically and consistently harmonized with the system and standards of the EU and the WTO. Last year, and in the course of this year, over 250 new laws and regulations have been passed and best efforts are being made to ensure their consistent enforcement. In November this year the new Constitution of Serbia was confirmed at a referendum. The Constitution is based on the principles of civil democracy, human and minority rights and liberties and is in full harmony with European principles and values including, of course, the respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of democratic countries.

This year, ladies and gentlemen, Serbia will – for the third consecutive year – register GDP growth of over 6%, inflation will halt at 7%, exports have been stepped up significantly, foreign currency reserves have already exceeded \$11 billion and foreign investments will reach \$4 billion. Major macro-economic stability is in evidence along with strengthened efforts to pursue the reforms and the processes geared at our country's integration into international and regional institutions and organisations.

It is beyond doubt that any future Government of the Republic of Serbia will follow through with the comprehensive economic and administrative reforms in order to build a modern and dynamic economy based on democracy and the rule of law while ensuring full respect for human rights.

I should like, on a final note, to once again underscore the resolve of the Republic of Serbia to take an active part in the process of overall economic cooperation in the region. Of course, here we also imply other forms of cooperation that are being pursued to the benefit of each individual state and the region as a whole in the framework of the Stability Pact, especially in the energy sector, in the field of transport and protection of the environment.

Thank you," Kostunica said in his address.

Article can be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=30244>

3) Kostunica to sign in CEFTA today

Government of Serbia Press Release

Belgrade, Dec 19, 2006 – Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica is in Bucharest today, where he will attend the annual summit of the Central European Free Trade Agreement (CEFTA) and sign the agreement.

Kostunica will also meet with Romanian President Traian Basescu to discuss the situation in the region and the status of Kosovo-Metohija.

The CEFTA summit is also attended by Prime Ministers of Montenegro Zeljko Sturanovic, Bosnia-Herzegovina Adnan Terzic and Albania Salji Berisa, whereas Macedonia and Croatia are represented by Deputy Prime Ministers Zoran Stavreski and Damir Polancec respectively.

Apart from leaders from Southeast Europe, the summit is attended by EU Enlargement Commissioner Olli Rehn, EU Trade Commissioner Peter Mendelson and Special Coordinator of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe Erhard Busek.

Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Albania, Moldova and UNMIK representing Kosovo-Metohija, will join the free trade agreement, whose current members are Romania, Croatia and Macedonia.

CEFTA was created on December 21, 1992 at the initiative of the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland and Hungary, that joined the EU on May 1, 2004 and thus stepped out of CEFTA.

This agreement should replace the present complicated system with 32 bilateral free trade agreements between Southeast European countries and its aim is to facilitate trade and investment in the region.

Apart from strengthening economic ties, CEFTA contributes to the process of European integration, and the EU accession has always been aim of this agreement.

Macedonia will take over the presiding over CEFTA next year.

Article can be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=30241>

4) Strategy for improvement of living conditions of Serbs in Kosovo presented

Government of Serbia Press Release

Belgrade, Dec 18, 2006 - Head of the Economic team for Kosovo-Metohija and southern Serbia Nenad Popovic said today that the Strategy for the long-term economic development of Serbian communities in Kosovo-Metohija aims to improve living conditions of the population and stop them from leaving the province.

Speaking at a press conference held after the plenary meeting of the Economic team at which the Strategy was presented, Popovic said that this Strategy is focused on the development of infrastructure, education, employment and measures for encouraging investments.

He said that the main strategic goals are intensive economic integration with the economy in other parts of Serbia and with neighbouring countries, improvement of living standards of the population and reduction of poverty of Serbian communities in Kosovo-Metohija, and stopping Serbs from leaving the province.

According to Popovic, a precondition for the functioning of the economy and decent life of people is securing electricity stability and the resolution of the acute problem of electricity shortages with the donation from the Serbian government, construction of new and reconstruction of the existing roads, as well as the recognition of Telekom Srbija's license and return of confiscated property.

The head of the Economic team said that incentives worth €70 million will be set aside from the state budget and the National Investment Plan next year for the realisation of the Strategy in Kosovo-Metohija.

Popovic announced that as of January 2007 a wide range of activities will begin with the aim of presenting the Strategy to all interested groups, from local communities to international financial and other organisations.

He also pointed out that the economic team drafted an action plan for the implementation of the strategy and stressed that if economic activities are to begin it is necessary to have institutional support through a wide network of offices of the National Employment Service.

Popovic stressed that according to the Strategy, the Trepca mining and processing company should be one of those that are to carry out the economic development of Kosovo-Metohija.

The head of the economic team also recalled that the Strategy for the long-term economic development of Serbian communities in Kosovo is the first document on long-term development of this region in the past 15 years. He stated that renowned experts from Serbia and abroad were engaged in its drafting, as well as that the Irish and Swedish experiences were referred to.

He added that the strategy was harmonised with the Serbian National Development Strategy from 2006 to 2012 and the Strategy for Serbia's EU Accession.

Popovic said that the Strategy for the long-term economic development of Southern Serbia was also presented at the economic team's plenary meeting adding that it is aimed at stimulating a favourable business climate, improving administrative capacities of local self-governments and improving the efficiency of local resource valorisation aiming to attract foreign capital to this region.

Article can be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=30237>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2007 6:16 PM
To: 'balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net'
Subject: Balkan Update: Letter by Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica to UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon

Balkan Update

Text of Letter by Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica of Serbia to UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon:

January 3, 2007

Honourable Secretary-General,

On behalf of the Serbian people and government I would like to congratulate you on your appointment as the new UN Secretary-General and wish you success in performing this supreme and responsible duty you have taken upon yourself.

I am convinced that as the first man of the UN you will have the support of all member states of this international organisation in your efforts to achieve the most important of goals and that is the preservation of peace and international order which are directly dependant of the respect of the UN Charter. You may rest assured that the Republic of Serbia will give its full contribution and offer all support to the realisation of this fundamental goal to which all free and democratic states in the world strive.

My country is a free and democratic European state in which all democratic values are respected, as well as human and minority rights, in which the highest European standards are valid and are being implemented. I would especially like to emphasise that Serbia whole-heartedly respects all of the UN's fundamental documents, particularly the UN Charter, that it is devoted to the principles of international law and the binding documents of the OSCE, such as the Helsinki Final Act, and that it of course adheres to Resolution 1244 of the Security Council which refers to the southern Serbian province of Kosovo-Metohija.

Honourable Secretary-General, you are acquainted with the fact that UN SC Resolution 1244 (from 1999) explicitly confirmed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Serbia and envisaged that the province of Kosovo-Metohija may realise its essential autonomy within Serbia. Having in mind that a year ago talks on the province's future status began under the UN SC auspices, it is my wish to use this opportunity and brief you on the Serbian government's principled stance and arguments regarding this matter.

The Serbian government stresses its absolute preparedness to provide the highest possible level of essential autonomy for Kosovo-Metohija, one that results from the European experience in the organisation of democratic states. That the solution stems from the UN Charter itself is of particular importance, as well as the fact that it is in complete accordance with it. At the same time, it does not breach, but confirms and implements the principles of international law upon which the entire contemporary international order is founded. In other words, we are prepared to talk with representatives of the ethnic Albanian minority living in Kosovo-Metohija and discuss any model of autonomy that is applied in Europe today. Serbia is determined and ready to achieve agreement on the implementation of a European model of autonomy for Kosovo through dialogue.

You may rest assured that the Serbian government is fully resolved and prepared to find a compromise

6/13/2007

and just solution for an adequate position of the province within Serbia in line with the UN Charter. On the other hand, it is clear that ethnic minorities, including ethnic Albanians in Serbia, may not sever portions of sovereign countries' territories and create new independent states. Such project contrived by ethnic Albanian separatists overthrows the basic principles of the UN Charter and annihilates the international law principles upon which the entire international order is founded. Any re-cut of interstate borders inevitably demolishes stability and peace in the entire region.

Honourable Secretary-General, since the UN Charter guarantees inviolability of borders and inviolability of state sovereignty and territorial integrity to all internationally recognised countries, the Serbian government explicitly requests that provisions of the UN Charter be fully applied on the Republic of Serbia. Your Excellency, I am convinced it is beyond any doubt and that it is unacceptable and impossible that Serbia's borders are remodelled against its will and that another Albanian state is created on 15% of the Serbian territory.

These are the reasons for the Serbian government to send a request to the UN today asking it to provide full protection of inviolability of Serbia's state borders and its sovereignty and territorial integrity. The UN Charter safeguards the integrity of internationally recognised states in the same way that a democratic state's constitution protects the integrity of each individual citizen in the state. The UN Charter's value is primarily in the fact that it is equally and without exceptions valid for all countries in the world, and in line with this simple principle it must be valid for Serbia.

Honourable Secretary-General, the Serbian government believes that the talks on the future status of Kosovo-Metohija have so far failed to yield concrete and desired results. The fact that until now only one meeting took place between top officials from Belgrade and representatives of ethnic Albanian minority from Kosovo-Metohija speaks volumes about the necessity of employing additional effort and engaging new energy so as to achieve progress that will take us closer to the actual solution. The Serbian government finds it is necessary to organise new serious talks to determine the future degree and type of autonomy for Kosovo-Metohija within Serbia and expects them to be held in the upcoming period. The government and all Serbia's representatives are fully prepared to take their share of responsibility for finding a compromise, lasting, sustainable and just solution based on the UN Charter and international law principles.

My country, its political representatives and myself personally stand at your disposal for any support you need in striving to place the solving of the issue of Kosovo-Metohija's autonomy on healthy grounds and bases of negotiating process with good prospects for achieving a proper solution to the benefit and welfare of all Serbian citizens and the entire southeast European region.

Honourable Secretary-General, I once more most heartily congratulate you on your appointment and wish you great success in fulfilling this responsible duty. I would like to use this opportunity and send you my personal greetings and wishes for a successful and happy 2007.

The letter and Serbian Government press release can be found at:
<http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=30771>.

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]

Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2007 6:34 PM

Subject: Balkan Update: "Serbia's people should not be punished for the Milosevic era "

Contents:

1. "Serbia's people should not be punished for the Milosevic era"
Slobodan Samardzic, Co-ordinator of the Serbian Negotiation Team
Letters, *Financial Times*, January 10, 2007
2. "Serbia has offered highest possible autonomy to Kosovo"
Ivan Vujacic, Ambassador of Serbia to the United States
Letters, *Financial Times*, January 8, 2007

Letters:

1. "Serbia's people should not be punished for the Milosevic era"
Slobodan Samardzic, Co-ordinator of the Serbian Negotiation Team
Letters, *Financial Times*, January 10, 2007

Sir, Joseph Biden ("Opponents of a new Kosovo must be stopped", January 3) is right to suggest that "stability in south-east Europe would be a welcome bit of good news". But Senator Biden's position on Kosovo reflects a disappointing lack of appreciation for both international law and the progress of Serbian democracy since the Milosevic era.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) explicitly confirmed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Serbia. This resolution also envisioned Kosovo realising its autonomy within Serbia, which Serbia is determined to achieve as we seek a European model of autonomy for Kosovo. The Serbian government is actively involved in negotiations towards a solution for Kosovo that respects international law and the United Nations, which Senator's Biden's proposal does not.

Serbia's historic transition to democracy since October 2000 is already the good news story in the Balkans. On the other hand, the world has witnessed the lack of democracy and human rights in Kosovo during this same period. I am puzzled by Mr Biden's assertion that independence for Kosovo - though a weak, corrupt and potentially failed state - would somehow enhance regional stability in the Balkans. This is not explained. Many European countries and analysts fear such a scenario.

Senator Biden's attack on Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica is unfair. Mr Kostunica, a lifelong leader of the democratic political opposition in Serbia, defeated Slobodan Milosevic for the Serb presidency in 2000. The people and government of Serbia today should not be punished for events that took place in Serbia and the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s during the Milosevic era.

If "bad news" out of the Balkans is to be avoided, any decision on Kosovo's final status must be negotiated with Belgrade and its democratically elected government. If damage to the credibility of the international system is to be avoided, any agreement on Kosovo's future status must be reached in a way that neither violates international law nor undermines the UN.

Slobodan Samardzic
Co-ordinator of the Serbian Negotiation Team
Belgrade, Serbia

6/13/2007

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:19
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

This letter can also be found at: <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/916eed36-a04f-11db-9059-0000779e2340.html>

2. "Serbia has offered highest possible autonomy to Kosovo"

Ivan Vujacic, Ambassador of Serbia to the United States

Letters, *Financial Times*, January 8, 2007

Sir, Senator Joe Biden ("Opponents of a new Kosovo must be stopped", January 3) proposes recognising independence without sovereignty (because it is not ready) for Kosovo, currently a province of Serbia, under United Nations administration.

He believes this "could yield a victory for Muslim democracy" and provide a "much-needed example of a successful US-Muslim partnership". The impediments to this outcome are "extremists" in Belgrade and Moscow who will "conspire" to prevent Kosovo's independence.

For anyone following the situation, it is difficult to agree that extremists are in power in Serbia. Since the democratic revolution that overthrew Slobodan Milosevic, Serbia has been radically transformed economically, politically and has had major achievements in the strengthening of human and minority rights.

It has had several elections that have produced governments that are committed to European and Atlantic integration. It has offered the highest possible autonomy for Kosovo within Serbia in the negotiations on its future status. Surely, this is not extremism.

The truth of the matter is that Kosovo has a dismal record regarding basic security, the rule of law and respect for property and human rights for non-Albanians. Democracy should be universal and not ethnic, nor based on religion. Should the threat of violence be rewarded by a quick move to independence or is Kosovo just a propaganda tool for the Muslim world as Senator Biden seems to suggest?

Serbia expects that the principles of international law and the UN Charter should be adhered to. It does not believe that a democratic nation should be dismembered. It has stated so publicly. Surely, this is not conspiracy.

Ivan Vujacic
Ambassador of Serbia to the US

Copyright The Financial Times Limited 2007

This letter can also be found at: <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/6f762382-9ebc-11db-ac03-0000779e2340.html>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2007 1:37 PM
To: 'balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net'
Subject: Balkan Update: Serbia insists on respect of UN Charter and international law

Balkan Update

- 1) Serbia insists on respect of UN Charter and international law**
Government of Serbia Press Release
February 7, 2007
- 2) Serbian government to propose resolution on Kosovo-Metohija**
Government of Serbia Press Release
February 7, 2007
- 1) Serbia insists on respect of UN Charter and international law**
Government of Serbia Press Release
February 7, 2007

Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica said today that Serbia will continue to be constructive when it comes to negotiations on the future status of Kosovo-Metohija, but also intransigent in its position that the UN Charter and the principle of territorial integrity and sovereignty be respected in the case of Serbia too.

Speaking at a press conference held after the meeting with the EU Three – German Minister of Foreign Affairs Frank-Walter Steinmeier, EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana and EU Enlargement Commissioner Olli Rehn, Kostunica said that today's talks focused on the future status of Kosovo and Serbia's European Integration. Kostunica underlined that Serbia is firmly committed to continue on its road to Europe.

He said that since the proposal for the future status of Kosovo-Metohija drawn up by UN Special Representative Martti Ahtisaari was presented to Belgrade a few days ago, he gave the first evaluations and analyses of this document, which will be presented to Serbian parliament after its formation. This body will give its opinion on the document, a mandate for negotiations and it will also form a negotiating team.

The Serbian Prime Minister said that the proposal of the future status of Kosovo followed the negotiations that were held in Vienna last year, only at one single session, held on July 24, when there was a chance to touch on the issue of the province's future status.

Ahtisaari's proposal, observed as a whole, but in terms of annexes as well, shows that majority of Serbia's requests were not accepted, Kostunica explained, adding that the first part of the proposal that refers to the future status of Kosovo-Metohija, does not proceed from the negotiations conducted in Vienna.

According to Kostunica, in Ahtisaari's proposal it can be seen that he departs from the mandate given to him by the UN, because Ahtisaari proposes the future status of Serbia without Kosovo-Metohija, that is, through the creation of an independent Kosovo-Metohija and a new, second Albanian state in the territory of Serbia, by snatching away a part of its territory.

In this proposal, Ahtisaari did not deal with the only thing that falls within his mandate, and that is the

future status of Kosovo-Metohija, with the respect for the UN Charter and the provisions on territorial sovereignty and integrity, and for the UN Security Council Resolution 1244, which also confirms the territorial sovereignty and integrity of Serbia, Kostunica stressed.

Kostunica pointed to the fact that the proposal contains no element of compromise between Belgrade and Pristina, which is, according to him, easy to achieve, but under one condition, that it should be sought within the frameworks of international law and the UN Charter.

He reiterated that if the UN Charter is overlooked and the principle of territorial integrity and sovereignty of existing states upon which international order is based is not respected, then compromise is impossible.

The solution for the issue of Kosovo-Metohija, whatever it might be, can not be an isolated case and will certainly affect many other countries. This is a most serious precedent for all countries which could find themselves in a similar situation, therefore this issue is not important just for Serbia, but is of importance for regional and global stability, stressed Kostunica.

The Serbian Prime Minister said that Serbian parliament will declare itself regarding this matter in a few days, and added that these few days are needed for the formation of parliament which will come forward with a platform and a negotiating team.

He pointed to the fact that Ahtisaari has presented a proposal regarding the future status of Kosovo-Metohija at a moment when Serbia does not have a new parliament, nor a newly elected government, which makes it necessary to postpone negotiations for a minimum period of time, so that Serbian parliament can hold session to examine the issue of Kosovo-Metohija.

When it comes to the issue of European integration, Kostunica reiterated that Serbia is firmly determined to continue negotiations on the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA), which is proved by all that has been done in Serbia during the past period and previous few years.

He reminded that serious legislative reforms were implemented in Serbia, the new Constitution was adopted, fair and democratic elections were held according to the Constitution, economic stability and growth, and security for foreign investment was also achieved.

Serbia is taking all necessary steps so that when negotiations are continued and the issue of formal membership in the EU comes up, the country is entirely ready for it, said Kostunica.

He concluded that political will does exist, and all other measures have been taken and negotiations on the SAA and visa relaxations have proved Serbia's capacity and quality.

He added that the EU is also happy that parties of democratic orientation won a two-third majority at the recently held elections in Serbia, adding that this carries a great responsibility and an obligation to continue strengthening the legal state and carrying out democratic reforms in Serbia.

In that sense, the EU expects that Serbia will soon compose a new democratic government and convene a new parliament, in which process EU sincerely endorses Serbia's efforts to continue on the road to European integration, Steinmeier said.

He said that Serbia is going through a very important historical moment in which it is to bring some very important decisions, and once more he pointed to the fact that the EU considers Serbia a part of Europe.

Solana stressed that the EU is willing to continue negotiations on the SAA with Serbia, and added that Serbia needs to form a new democratic government as soon as possible for that.

He said that the matter was discussed in today's talks with Kostunica, and expressed satisfaction with the fact that Kostunica showed willingness and determination to work intensively towards resolving the

question of formation of parliament and the new government.

Rehn also pointed to the importance of continuing negotiations on the SAA, and the importance of forming a new parliament and government in that context, which would be equally devoted to the aims which are of paramount importance to Serbia, and these are full cooperation for continuing negotiations on the SAA, as well as full cooperation with the Hague tribunal.

He reiterated that Serbia has full support of the EU, which is reflected in today's meeting in Belgrade.

The Serbian Government press release can be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=31564>.

2) Serbian government to propose resolution on Kosovo-Metohija
Government of Serbia Press Release
February 8, 2007

Coordinator of the Serbian state team for negotiations on the future status of Kosovo-Metohija Slobodan Samardzic said today that the Serbian government will propose a resolution on Kosovo-Metohija on the occasion of the proposal of UN Special Envoy Martti Ahtisaari on the future status of Kosovo. The resolution is to be adopted by a new convocation of Serbian parliament.

Samardzic told the Beta news agency that the formal proposer of the resolution will be the Serbian government, while the text of the proposal will be drawn up by the current negotiating team.

He said that the government will propose that the current team remains in function until a new government is set up.

The resolution will contain a clear stance concerning Ahtisaari's proposal and the position that the negotiations should be continued. It will be proposed that the current negotiation team conduct negotiations in Vienna, scheduled by UN Special Envoy Martti Ahtisaari.

Samardzic added that the team will be in function until a new Serbian government is formed, which will propose the new composition of the negotiating team.

The Serbian Government press release can be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=31589>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 5:56 PM
To: 'Balkan Update'
Subject: Balkan Update: State negotiating team requests demilitarisation of Kosovo

Balkan Update

1) State negotiating team requests demilitarisation of Kosovo

Government of Serbia Press Release
March 1, 2007

2) First round of status talks in Vienna ends

Government of Serbia Press Release
March 2, 2007

1) State negotiating team requests demilitarisation of Kosovo

Government of Serbia Press Release
March 1, 2007

Vienna - The state negotiating team for talks on future status of Kosovo requested at today's talks held in Vienna that the province be demilitarised and that the international military and police forces be in charge of its safety.

Coordinator of the state negotiating team Slobodan Samardzic told the press after the talks held in Austria Centre that with its amendments, the Serbian delegation wanted to remove all doubts concerning the violation of Serbia's sovereignty and territorial integrity in Kosovo-Metohija.

Our position is that the future international military presence in Kosovo-Metohija should be regulated by a special agreement between Serbia and the UN, with the UN establishing the mandate and modality of sending international military troops to the province, Samardzic explained.

He emphasised that Belgrade requests that the international civil representative in Kosovo-Metohija be established also by a special agreement between Serbia and the UN, on the basis of which the mandate of the international civil representative would be determined.

Samardzic said that Martti Ahtisaari's proposal on setting up future Kosovo security forces was also discussed today.

In that proposal, we saw a nucleus of the future Albanian army in Kosovo-Metohija. We refused that entire part because it is not in harmony with our proposal which we presented already on the first day of the negotiations and that is that Kosovo be demilitarised, Samardzic said. He added that the international military forces would be present in the province "temporarily".

The Albanian side showed great enthusiasm, they simply want to make an army. We had a discussion on that issue and I think that our arguments were much more convincing, Samardzic said.

Coordinator of the negotiating team Leon Kojen stated that in the annexes of Ahtisaari's plan dealing with the international civil representative and international military presence in Kosovo-Metohija, there are certain provisions with which the Belgrade delegation agreed because, as he said, Belgrade is not against an international presence in the province.

However, we insist that both institutions should be established on the basis of an agreement made between Serbia and the UN, Kojen said and added that the main difference between Belgrade and Pristina in today's talks concerned demilitarisation in Kosovo-Metohija.

He underlined that differences on that issue are irreconcilable because it is not clear what the purpose of those new Kosovo military forces would be.

We think that they would be a blow to regional stability. I think that would destabilise parts of Macedonia, Montenegro, perhaps even the area around Presevo and Bujanovac, Kojen warned.

He said that Belgrade made an explicit request that Serbia's border in Kosovo-Metohija be secured by international military forces and border police units of the Serbian Ministry of Interior.

The Pristina delegation requested the urgent formation of a Kosovo army.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=32049>

2) First round of status talks in Vienna ends
Government of Serbia Press Release
March 2, 2007

Belgrade/Vienna – Coordinator of the state team for talks on Kosovo-Metohija's future status Leon Kojen stated that the first round of negotiations ended today in Vienna, adding that Belgrade and Pristina failed to reach any kind of agreement.

Following the meeting Kojen told the press that this was not unexpected, but added that the talks were well organised and immaculately led.

"It is not clear to which degree Ahtisaari will accept the large number of amendments Belgrade submitted. Next week we will receive a supplemented version of Ahtisaari's proposal for the future status of Kosovo-Metohija and we will then be able to provide more arguments and say whether the consultations will yield any positive results", the Serbian team's coordinator said.

He announced that the Belgrade negotiating team will submit a report to Serbian parliament which will include all amendments Belgrade put forth in Vienna.

Kojen voiced hope that Serbia's position in the process of resolving the province's status will once again be confirmed at parliament session.

Coordinator of the Serbian team Slobodan Samardzic said that during today's talks on the implementation of Ahtisaari's plan, Belgrade submitted a number of amendments, particularly concerning the section which says that Kosovo parliament should deal both with constitution and legislature.

He explained that Belgrade believes that an agreement should be signed first, then a constitution adopted and finally elections held for the formation of a new parliament.

This parliament does not have authority to pass laws in the transitional period, Samardzic said and added that the agreement should be signed by Belgrade, interim Kosovo institutions and the international community.

The negotiations in Vienna started on February 21. Both Belgrade and Pristina remained at their flatly opposed positions concerning the Kosovo status, but concerning many other aspects of Ahtisaari's plan too.

The second round of talks, at a higher level, will be organised on March 10, and then Ahtisaari will present a final version of his proposal to the Security Council which will bring a decision on Kosovo's future status.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=32074>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]

Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2007 4:09 PM

To: 'Balkan Update'

Subject: Serbia: Any unilateral recognition of Kosovo's independence would be null and void

Balkan Update

Any unilateral recognition of Kosovo's independence would be null and void

Government of Serbia Press Release

March 5, 2007

Belgrade- Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica pointed out today in the talks with US Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Daniel Fried that any one-sided and unilateral recognition of independence of Kosovo-Metohija would be null and void and would represent a gross violation of the UN Security Council Resolution 1244, which is binding for all UN members.

Kostunica said that the Serbian negotiating team at negotiations in Vienna was constructive and fully defended positions of the Serbian parliament's Resolution which clearly rejects all proposals from the plan of UN Special Envoy Martti Ahtisaari that violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Serbian state.

The Serbian Prime Minister stated that the solution for Kosovo-Metohija must be sought through a compromise of the two sides, which can be achieved if international law and the UN Charter are respected, whose basic principles are the preservation of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the states. He added that every state in the world insists on the inviolability of their internationally recognised borders.

Kostunica warned that UN Special Envoy Martti Ahtisaari exceeded his mandate and instead of enabling talks that would lead to achieving a compromise solution concerning the province's administration, he opened the question of Serbia's state status and proposed redrawing its internationally recognised borders.

The Serbian Prime Minister underlined that UN SC Resolution 1244 is in force and that it guarantees sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Serbian state.

US Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Daniel Fried said that the US expects that Serbia will play a constructive part in the following round of negotiations which will be held in Vienna.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=32151>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2007 5:20 PM
To: 'Balkan Update'
Subject: Serbia: Negotiating team constructively partake in Kosovo status talks

Balkan Update

Negotiating team constructively partake in Kosovo status talks Government of Serbia Press Release March 8, 2007

Belgrade- Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica said today in a meeting with NATO Secretary General Jaap De Hoop Scheffer that the Serbian state negotiating team took part constructively in the Kosovo status talks.

Kostunica stressed that the Serbian delegation advocated positions set forth in the Resolution passed by Serbian parliament, according to which proposals from Martti Ahtisaari's plan violating Serbia's sovereignty and territorial integrity are rejected.

The Prime Minister stressed that Ahtisaari's mandate was to find a compromise for the future status of Kosovo-Metohija, and not to question the state status of Serbia and suggest seizure of 15% of its territory.

He also said that it is possible to come up with a compromise if international law and the UN Charter are respected as they guarantee sovereignty and territorial integrity, whereas the solution would be substantial autonomy within Serbia's internationally recognised borders.

Kostunica said that Serbia strongly advocates for respect of international law and keeping stability in the region, noting that many European countries are now also pointing to that.

Scheffer said that NATO supports the process guided by UN Special Envoy Martti Ahtisaari.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=32218>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]

Sent: Friday, March 09, 2007 6:48 PM

To: 'Balkan Update'

Subject: Serbia: 1) New proposal of Martti Ahtisaari not acceptable 2) Prime Minister to strongly advocate Resolution on Kosovo at Vienna talks

Balkan Update

1) New proposal of Martti Ahtisaari not acceptable for Serbia

Government of Serbia Press Release

March 8, 2007

2) Prime Minister to strongly advocate Resolution on Kosovo at Vienna talks

Government of Serbia Press Release

March 9, 2007

1) New proposal of Martti Ahtisaari not acceptable for Serbia

Government of Serbia Press Release

March 8, 2007

Belgrade - The Serbian state negotiating team for the talks on the future status of Kosovo-Metohija stated today that the new proposal of UN Special Envoy Martti Ahtisaari, submitted yesterday, is not acceptable for Serbia because not a single amendment proposed by Belgrade referring to the preservation of Serbia's sovereignty and territorial integrity has been accepted.

Today's meeting of the state negotiating team, chaired by Serbian Prime Minister and the team's co-president Vojislav Kostunica, was attended by Serbian President and the team's co-president Boris Tadic, Minister of Foreign Affairs Vuk Draskovic and the team's members.

The team members concluded that in Ahtisaari's new proposal there are no essential changes in relation to the first version of the proposal that violates the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Serbia. There are also no other solutions that accept the completely justified positions of Serbia on other issues that were negotiated in Vienna.

The report on talks conducted in Vienna from February 21 to March 3, 2007 was adopted at the meeting.

The delegation for the negotiations scheduled for March 10, 2007 has been chosen. The delegation will be headed by Serbian President and Serbian Prime Minister - Boris Tadic and Vojislav Kostunica, and they will be accompanied by Foreign Minister Vuk Draskovic and members of the state team.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=32241>

2) Prime Minister to strongly advocate Resolution on Kosovo at Vienna talks

Government of Serbia Press Release

March 9, 2007

Belgrade - Director of the government's Office of Media Relations Srdjan Djuric stated today that at tomorrow's talks in Vienna, Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica will strongly advocate the positions stated in the Resolution on Kosovo-Metohija adopted by Serbian parliament, since political parties in Serbia have unanimously agreed on them.

Prior to talks on Kosovo-Metohija's future status between Belgrade and Pristina top officials, Djuric said in a statement to the Beta news agency that the Resolution is in accordance with all fundamental principles on which international order is based.

According to Djuric, it is crystal clear that all arguments are in favour of Belgrade, whereas on the other hand, there are threats of violence and terror if the province is not granted independence.

"Belgrade will never give up on trying to find a compromise solution and we strongly believe it is necessary that Ahtisaari includes the model of substantial autonomy for the province in the core of upcoming talks", said Djuric.

He also added that all sides of the substantial autonomy model must be explored in order to find out whether there are any unfavourable aspects of that solution.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=32249>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:19
CNM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2007 5:21 PM
To: 'Balkan Update'
Subject: Serbia advocates compromise, just solution of Kosovo-Metohija's status

Balkan Update

Serbia advocates compromise, just solution of Kosovo-Metohija's status Government of Serbia Press Release March 10, 2007

Vienna – In today's address at the talks on Kosovo-Metohija's future status, held at the Hofburg Palace in Vienna, Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica said that the process of resolving the Kosovo issue must be directed towards finding a compromise and just solution which would enable peaceful and safe future for everyone in Kosovo-Metohija, entire Serbia and beyond.

Kostunica said that any wrong decision will inevitably have far-reaching consequences for Serbia, as well as the entire Balkan region.

"In other words, this means that any misconceived decision would represent a dangerous precedent for the entire international order. Today, we still have the opportunity to make a decision together in order to direct the resolution process towards a compromise and just solution which will enable a peaceful and safe future for everyone in Kosovo, the entire Serbia and beyond", said the Prime Minister.

He said that today's meeting will achieve its highest goal if the collocutors manage to adjust Ahtisaari's proposal to the fundamental principles of international law, the UN Charter, the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, as well as the actual interests of both ethnic Albanians and Serbs in Kosovo-Metohija.

"Serbia is under obligation to recognise the fact that, in the form in which Ahtisaari's proposal was presented to us, many of its provisions directly breach Serbia's sovereignty and territorial integrity, reshape its international borders, cut its territory and allow that 15% of its territory be severed and another Albanian state formed in the Balkans", said Kostunica.

He stressed that the proposal does not resolve the status of Kosovo-Metohija, but in fact opens the issue of Serbia's status as a state, which is completely illegal and illegitimate.

"Therefore the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia decided to reject all provisions of Mister Ahtisaari's proposal which breach the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Serbia. This decision of the National Assembly is final and irrevocable", emphasised Kostunica.

He said that at this meeting, Serbia is stating its position and confirming it is fully determined not to give up on trying to find a just, compromise and sustainable solution.

As a free and sovereign country, Serbia is declaring that it will reject any imposed solution with equal determination, he said. "We are duly warning that any attempt at imposing a solution to a free state is equal to legal violence and represents an absolutely impermissible way of solving current problems", said the Prime Minister.

Kostunica stressed that Serbia is one of the UN founding countries and its full member, therefore the validity of the UN Charter, as well as the Helsinki Final Act, for Serbia is beyond question.

"Serbia is pointing to the fact that ever since the UN were formed and the UN Charter came into force,

never has a considerable portion of territory been taken from one of its member countries. The severing of Kosovo-Metohija from Serbia would represent the most dangerous precedent in the history of the UN", said the Prime Minister and invited all states to help prevent this perilous development and resist the creation of a precedent which will tomorrow lead to new alterations of borders and endanger the foundations upon which the entire international order is based.

Kostunica said that Serbia is under obligation to bring to their attention another consequential fact, namely that threats of ethnic Albanian separatists may now be heard more often in which they threaten to resort to open violence if the province is not granted independence.

"The entire international community today must face this challenge openly. It is their obligation to decidedly and without compromise, for the sake of the future of the world we live in, respond that threats of terror must never be succumbed to. Such concessions are not a solution, not even a short-term one, but inevitably represent a promotion of violence as a means of achieving political goals", said Kostunica.

The Serbian Prime Minister said that hundreds of thousands of Serbs have been exiled from Kosovo-Metohija and the structure of the population there radically changed in the last half a century.

"It is a known fact that after the World War II 30% of Serbs lived in the province and that this number was extremely reduced through separatists' activities and banishment of Serbs. This is the best proof that in the basis of independent Kosovo lies the project of an ethnically clean Kosovo-Metohija and this is the key reason why separatists are systematically preventing the return of thousands of exiles despite the presence of an international peace mission in the province", said Kostunica. He added that whoever resorts to violence in order to achieve their goals must be most harshly punished, especially since this has not been the case so far, despite the presence of international military forces in Kosovo-Metohija.

This means the international community carries not a small share of responsibilities, said Kostunica adding that in his report to the Security Council from October 24, 2005, Special Envoy Kai Eide also speaks of this responsibility.

He particularly stressed that Serbia strongly insists that UN SC Resolution 1244 and obligations stemming from it be the foundation for the talks and the basis for finding a compromise solution.

"During the one year of talks, including the six month break, this was completely disregarded. In fact, the talks were led under the shadow of allegedly already known solution, which impeded the course of the negotiations and disabled the search for a compromise solution", added Kostunica.

He emphasised that UN SC Resolution 1244 explicitly confirms Serbia's sovereignty and territorial integrity and the inviolability of its internationally recognised borders.

"This is understandable, since the Security Council's Resolution cannot be opposed to the UN Charter. However, apart from this obvious truth, Resolution 1244 also clearly determines the obligations that must be fulfilled, which primarily refer to the issue of standards, above all to the rights of Serbs and other non-ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. The indisputable and easily verifiable truth is that in all essential matters, standards are simply not being fulfilled", said Kostunica. He added that it is of greatest interest that Ahtisaari makes additional effort regarding further talks and introduces in his proposal the most important elements of Resolution 1244.

At the end of his address, the Serbian Prime Minister said that Serbia is taking this opportunity to call for a continuation of proper and comprehensive negotiations on the basis of Resolution 1244 which would lead to a compromise solution, in line with the UN Charter and the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=32261>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:21
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2007 9:51 PM
To: 'Balkan Update'
Subject: Solution for Kosovo-Metohija through new negotiation process

Balkan Update

Solution for Kosovo-Metohija through new negotiation process Government of Serbia Press Release March 15, 2007

Belgrade – Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica said today that the proposal by UN Special Envoy Marti Ahtisaari regarding the status of Kosovo-Metohija does not fulfill a single condition for debate in the UN Security Council and added that the solution lies in opening a new negotiation process.

Vojislav Kostunica

In a statement to the news agency Tanjug, Kostunica said that Ahtisaari's proposal does not even fulfill formal conditions, because it is obviously not a compromise solution, rather Ahtisaari has decided to take sides with ethnic-Albanians, and has drafted a one-sided proposal.

He said that in doing so Ahtisaari has violated the foremost principle of the Contact Group, which recommended a solution based on compromise and agreement.

It is important to stress that Ahtisaari's proposal in essence does not fulfill the conditions for appearing before the Security Council, keeping in view the fact that this proposal grossly violates the UN Charter and the fundamental principles of the violability of borders and respect of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of internationally recognised states, stressed Kostunica.

The Serbian Prime Minister said that due to that Ahtisaari's proposal was rejected as illegal and illegitimate.

We are convinced that the Security Council cannot support a proposal which is directly opposed to the UN Charter, stressed Kostunica.

He said that Serbia sees the solution in beginning a new process of real and actual negotiations, which would lead to an agreement, in accordance with international law and the Constitution of Serbia.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=32416>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2007 2:48 PM
To: 'Balkan Update'
Subject: Statement by Dr. Sandra Rašković-Ivić to the UN Security Council

Balkan Update

**Statement by Dr. Sanda Rašković-Ivić
President of the Coordination Centre of the Republic of Serbia for Kosovo and Metohija
United Nations Security Council
New York City, New York
March 19, 2007**

Mr. President,
Distinguished members of the Security Council,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am particularly pleased to be able to greet you today and express to this august body of the world Organization my heartfelt appreciation.

Today's meeting of the Security Council is held immediately after the conclusion of the failed talks about the future status of the province of Kosovo and Metohija, held in Vienna on 10 March. There are numerous reasons for the unsuccessful conclusion of these negotiations and I shall say more about that later.

At the outset, I would like to point out that the Republic of Serbia firmly believes that the decisions of the United Nations Security Council will have a crucial impact on durable peace and security not only in my country, but also worldwide. Many eyes are turned today upon the Western Balkans, because a number of sovereign and democratic countries are in fear of a possible precedent that would breach the fundamental principle of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of internationally recognized states. Therefore, I would like to stress the special importance of the Security Council as a guarantor of the implementation of the UN Charter. This body is entrusted with the task of ensuring the respect and maintenance of the universal principles of international law. This implies that it is the body on which the stability of the overall international order depends. Serbia expresses its firm conviction that the UN SC, in observance of the UN Charter, will reject every attempt to take away from the Republic of Serbia, a UN member state, 15 percent of its territory and to change its internationally recognized borders, without its consent.

You are all well aware of the fact that the Vienna talks about the future status of the Serbian province of Kosovo and Metohija were unsuccessful. They failed to yield any result, because no agreement was reached. Let me remind you that the mandate of Special Envoy of the UN Secretary-General Martti Ahtisaari was to act as a mediator in pursuit of a compromise solution. Instead, by overstepping the mandate, Special Envoy Mr. Ahtisaari has opted for the imposition of a solution which suits the purpose of only one, Albanian side.

It is also important to underline that Mr. Ahtisaari's proposal has not been formulated as a compromise negotiated solution by the two sides. None of the almost 500 amendments that the Serbian side submitted to Mr. Ahtisaari's draft document has been accepted. In other words, this is leading to the imposed solution, which is in violation of the UN Charter, UN SC resolution 1244, the Helsinki Final Act and the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia. I shall take the liberty of asking what the countries that you represent would do if they received such a proposal. We all know the answers to these

6/13/2007

questions. Serbia's final answer is well-known and clear, and it reads – we reject the proposal which takes away 15 percent of our territory.

Mr. President,

The Government of my country remains firmly convinced that the Security Council will consistently adhere to the UN Charter, thus enabling genuine negotiations on the future status of Kosovo and Metohija to begin, with a new mediator in the negotiations. Serbia is of the opinion that a new round of negotiations is the only path towards a just and sustainable solution. We are ready for a compromise about the future status of the province of Kosovo and Metohija. We would also like to take this opportunity to stress that the Republic of Serbia is willing to ensure the highest degree of autonomy for the Albanian community in Kosovo and Metohija and to provide substantial autonomy for the province. Substantial autonomy is certainly the most promising way for the Albanian national minority in the province to manage its future.

I specially want to underline that in recent days Serbia has marked three years from the violence of Albanian terrorists and separatists, who, on 17 and 18 March 2004, sought to complete the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo and Metohija. And while UNSC resolution 1244 sets out absolutely clear obligations and standards that have to be met, the life of the Serbs and other non-Albanians in the province is marked by violence and a permanent threat of terror by Albanian separatists. We all know that so far no one has presented a single argument why the Albanians should create another Albanian state in the territory of Serbia. Given that it is impossible to find such an argument, since it would be in direct breach of the principles of international law, there have already been announcements, vocal and public, that Albanian terrorists will repeat the scenario of three years ago, when on 17 March they killed Serbs and burnt and destroyed everything that was of the Serbian origin in the province.

Serbia would like to point out here in the UN SC to these threats by Albanian separatists and terrorists in a timely fashion and request that the UN SC takes all the measures aimed at ensuring the compliance with UNSC resolution 1244, which guarantees peace and security to all the inhabitants of the province. Particularly inadmissible is the possibility to shift the responsibility for the announced violence by Albanian terrorists to somebody else and say that it is not the terrorists who are to be blamed, but the victims, because they failed to voluntarily meet the demands of the terrorists. No one has the right today to turn the head away from the reality and refuse to condemn, while there is still time, the threat of terror loud and clear. There are no differences when it comes to terror and terrorism, irrespective of whether they take place in Kosovo or any other part of the world. It is the obligation of the UN SC to warn that resolution 1244 has to be observed and that any sort of violence will be most severely punished.

There is ample evidence that UNSC resolution 1244 is being violated as a matter of routine and that violence against Serbs and other non-Albanians is committed on a daily basis. Thus, 52 ethnically motivated attacks on Serbs or members of non-Albanian communities were committed in Kosovo and Metohija in the past four months alone. In 22 of them, the targets of the extremists were returnee Serbs or their property. The attacks were carried out mainly in the territory of northern Metohija. Violence against the inhabitants of Priluzje near Vučitrn was announced in leaflets in advance. Some members of the special Kosovo Protection Force unit "Rosa" threatened the villagers of Štrpce on Mt. Brezovica, thus taking part in systematic intimidation. Intimidation is also evident in central Kosovo, in the north, in Oraovac and Kosovsko Pomoravlje. The Albanian daily papers publish lists of unwelcome Serbs. Their names were also published on billboards. Threats are made with the aim of compelling the Serbs to flee on a massive scale. Religious facilities of the Serbian Orthodox Church in seven cases were desecrated and damaged. I shall cite the example of the desecration of the Serbian church of St. John the Baptist in Peć on 5 March 2007. This church had been damaged in the March 2004 pogrom against Serbs. Rebuilt with the funds of the Council of Europe, it was desecrated all over again. Mr. Terry Davis, Secretary General of the Council of Europe warned that if the culture of violence does not stop all the communities in Kosovo and Metohija will become the hostages of violence.

Especially serious concern is caused by the reemergence of people in black uniforms, who do not belong

to any official formation in Kosovo and Metohija. They are members of paramilitary units, who illegally stop cars, carry out searches, inquire nationality of people, abduct and beat Serbs. In the period from 6 to 9 March alone, Serbs from Čaglavica and Laplje Selo were victims of the violence and plunder by these paramilitary units on a number of occasions. Slaviša Stolić, Dejan Mitić, a teacher, and Zoran Dragović, a worker, were victims of those attacks. Similarly, in Čaglavica, four masked persons abducted and robbed Zdenko Gorše, a worker, who distributes the Serbian-language press.

Let me reiterate that all the above occurred in only three days, but that these attacks, just like many other tragic events, did not have any impact on UNMIK's assessment according to which "the security situation and the freedom of movement are stable, but fragile." Only the language of bureaucratic indifference can reconcile the contradiction in terms of the coexistence of stable but fragile situation in Kosovo and Metohija. After the loss of two lives of Albanian protesters in the recent demonstrations in Pristina, Minister of Home Affairs of the Provisional Institutions submitted his resignation. However, during the seven and half years, 931 Serbs have been killed, no perpetrator has been convicted and no resignation has been tendered. Still, ladies and gentlemen, regardless of all the efforts made by the administration to mitigate the harsh reality in Kosovo and Metohija and blur it with almost poetic license, it keeps recording black pages of deaths, pain and wounds.

The greatest concern is, of course, caused by the issue of return of internally displaced persons. It is a well-known fact that hundreds of thousands of Serbs were expelled from Kosovo and Metohija, as well as that the ethnic structure of the population in the province was dramatically changed in the twentieth century. We also know that in the 1960s Serbs accounted for 30 percent of the province's population. That number has been extremely reduced, due to the actions of separatists, pressures on Serbs and their expulsion. This is eloquent proof that the project of an ethnically pure Kosovo underpins the idea of independent Kosovo. It is the key reason why separatists and extremists, under the very eye of the international mission in the province, systematically prevent the return of internally displaced persons from Serbia and intimidate the Serbs who are still there.

According to the UNHCR data, in 2006, only 1,608 persons returned, of whom Serbs and Roma accounted for 31 and 54 percent respectively. The number of returnees is lower than in 2005, but even such a low number of 1,608 returnees is not accurate. The most recent example is an attempt of seventy-five families to return to the village of Babuš under the auspices of provisional Kosovo institutions. They were included in the sustainable return project, which was supposed to comprise two components. One component was the reconstruction of houses, while the other one should have been guaranteeing economic sustainability, that is, the building of mini-farms that would generate income and provide livelihood to the returnees. The houses were indeed reconstructed, but the obligation related to ensuring economic sustainability of returnees was not fulfilled, although the funds for that particular purpose had been set aside. Seventy-five Serbian families returned the keys of their houses, because they do not have the other essential preconditions for survival. In the same time, there is a threat that their houses would be given to the social cases in the municipality. This is just one of many examples, which illustrates systematic expulsion of the once already expelled Serbs.

Regarding privatization carried out in Kosovo and Metohija, it is necessary to once again stress its ethnically-based discriminatory nature. Serbs are totally denied their fundamental rights. Serbs are practically prevented from exercising their property rights, as is the case with the state of Serbia, which is also denied this right. There is no single Serb at the helm of any public enterprise whatsoever. In eight years, Serbs have been expelled from Priština, the capital of the province, altogether and out of 41,000 that lived in Priština in 1999, there are less than a hundred of them now. They live in hiding and in conditions beneath human dignity. In the clinical hospital in that city about 50 percent of the employees were Serbs before the arrival of UNMIK; today there is no single Serbian employee.

Mr. President,

It is our joint obligation to review the issue of Kosovo and Metohija as required by United Nations Security Council resolution 1244. That resolution explicitly confirms the sovereignty and territorial

integrity and inviolability of the internationally recognized borders of the Republic of Serbia, because no United Nations Security Council resolution may run counter the United Nations Charter. Furthermore, that resolution has also laid down clear-cut obligations that must be fulfilled in Kosovo and Metohija. They are related to the standards, above all the rights of Serbs and other non-Albanians in Kosovo and Metohija.

It is an easily verifiable truth that in all essential matters standards have not been met. We are just a few months away from the eighth anniversary of the arrival of international forces in Kosovo and Metohija. So, eight years have elapsed since the international community assumed responsibility for the implementation of the rule of law in Kosovo and Metohija.

It is of paramount importance to finally raise the question of honoring all the obligations arising from UNSC resolution 1244. That must be the basis for all our future talks. We simply have to objectively consider and determine what concretely has been done with respect to the standards and which commitments have not been honored and why. I particularly stress that, in all talks, we have to abide by UNSC resolution 1244, bearing in mind that Mr. Ahtisaari's proposal is completely in contravention of the resolution in force. His proposal does not meet any of the conditions, either in form or substance, to be discussed by the UN SC. It is a proposal which promotes solely the interests of the Albanian side and, more importantly, a proposal which directly violates the UN Charter. It is essentially important that precisely the commitments and conditions laid down in UNSC resolution 1244 set the direction of all further talks about the status of the province.

Pursuant to UNSC resolution 1244 we believe that the most important thing now is to introduce a model of substantial autonomy for the province of Kosovo and Metohija, as a fundamental issue in the new round of talks. It is necessary to responsibly and seriously explore the possibility for the system of government in the province to be based on true democratic foundations. It is a realistic and sustainable solution and, what is particularly important, it excludes the setting of a very dangerous precedent that would not only threaten peace and stability in the region, but also affect the overall international order.

The Government of Serbia strongly supports the initiative to continue the negotiating process. The Government of Serbia, Mr. President, also avails itself of this opportunity to urge dialogue and continuation of talks, genuine and detailed, conducted in good faith. Only such talks can result in a compromise and a negotiated solution, which will be in conformity with the UN Charter, and equally beneficial for both Serbs and Albanians and their shared future.

Mrs. Sanda Rašković-Ivić

President of the Coordination Centre of the Republic of Serbia for Kosovo and Metohija

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2007 8:32 AM
To: 'Balkan Update'
Subject: Address by Serbian Prime Minister Kostunica to the UN Security Council

Balkan Update

**Address by Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica to the UN Security Council
New York, New York
April 3, 2007**

Mr. President,
Distinguished representatives of the Security Council member-states,
Your Excellencies,
Ladies and gentlemen,

At the outset I wish to present my compliments to this august body of the World Organization. I believe that the distinguished representatives of the Security Council member states who are present here are well aware that Serbia is an old European state. It was a member of the League of Nations and later one of the founding members of the United Nations. With its centuries-old tradition of state building, Serbia has taken part in shaping the history of Europe and thus in contributing to the definition of lasting and universal values essential to the world that we live in. When saying this, I refer first of all to fundamental values such as justice and the rule of law.

I am certain that we all fully share the belief that every state has the right, guaranteed by the UN Charter, to demand that it be protected by the general principles of international law and elementary justice. To this date nobody has ever attempted to challenge the validity of the fundamental principle of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of internationally recognized states, or to question the principle of inviolability of their internationally recognized borders. I stress that this has never happened before, that is – not until the UN Secretary General's Special Envoy Mr. Martti Ahtisaari presented his proposal on the Kosovo status settlement. In this respect, your Excellencies, we are indeed confronted with a potentially very dangerous precedent.

Serbia has already clearly stated that Special Envoy Ahtisaari in effect proposes to deprive Serbia of 15 percent of its territory. This is contrary to the principles of international law, contrary to the UN Charter, contrary to the UN SC Resolution 1244, contrary to the Helsinki Final Act, contrary to the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia and, last but not least, contrary to elementary justice. His proposal envisages that internationally recognized borders of Serbia should be redrawn against its will, by brutal imposition. The only justification offered is that thus Kosovo and Metohija Albanians, a national minority within our country, could form another Albanian state on Serbian territory, adjacent to the already existing state of Albania. When a nation is faced with such an attempt to trample upon law and justice, every citizen and the whole country know and are united in the feeling that the dignity of their state is profoundly undermined and its future called into question.

This, Mr. President, is the reason why Serbia has unambiguously rejected Ahtisaari's proposal as an unlawful and illegitimate attempt to dismember our state. It was not within the mandate of the Special Envoy to violate the principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity and to propose redrawing Serbia's internationally recognized borders. In fact, the UN Secretary General had given Mr. Ahtisaari the mandate to act as a mediator in the talks aimed at determining the future status of the Serbian province of Kosovo and Metohija. This is the way his role has to be understood within the UN framework: neither the Secretary General nor the Security Council could have given Mr. Ahtisaari the mandate to open the issue of the state status of Serbia, simply because this is not permitted under the UN Charter.

6/13/2007

The Security Council is the right place to ask Mr. Ahtisaari – what is the legal basis of his proposal to violate the principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity of internationally recognized states, thus depriving Serbia, a UN member state, of a significant part of its territory? The Special Envoy has so far been silent on this issue, and it is high time that he should repair this omission. Of course, we all know that, as long as the UN Charter remains in force, there simply cannot be any legal basis for such a proposal. No explanation can turn a violation of law into law, nor can brute might become right in such a manner.

The real question is: why has Special Envoy Ahtisaari chosen to act outside the scope of his mandate and why he has failed to take up the role of the mediator in the talks that should have been pursued within the framework of SC Resolution 1244 and the UN Charter? Renouncing his role as mediator, the Special Envoy has decided to come forward with a one-sided proposal of his own which completely disregards the position of Belgrade and is in direct violation of valid norms of international law.

The moment the Special Envoy decided to act contrary to the UN Charter, it became clear that his aim was not to help the two sides to reach a political compromise through a negotiated settlement. In fact, Mr. Ahtisaari deliberately adopted the position of the Albanian side and thus produced a proposal that only meets the demands of the Kosovo and Metohija Albanians. The best proof of this is the outright rejection of this plan by Serbia and its ready acceptance by the Albanians in the province.

From the very start of the status process, Mr. President, and I wish to emphasize this very strongly, Serbia made every effort to convince the Special Envoy that the key to his success lay in carefully observing two fundamental conditions. First, that the status talks must be pursued within the scope of the UN Charter, and that this entails respect for the inviolability of internationally recognized borders and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of existing states. Second, that he should be a mediator trying to find a political compromise and a mutually acceptable solution, and not an advocate of one side only, in this particular case the Kosovo and Metohija Albanians. In spite of our persistent reminders, Mr. Ahtisaari has clearly disregarded these two crucial conditions. In fact, his proposal directly contravenes the UN Charter, and this is why Serbia insists that the Security Council should reject it as unlawful and illegitimate.

The lack of any legal grounds for depriving Serbia of a part of its territory explains why Albanian separatists and terrorists have been increasingly resorting to threats of violence unless Kosovo is given independence. In the name of my country I ask you – can the Security Council afford to remain silent in the face of open threats of violence and, moreover, allow those threats to serve as an argument in favour of forming a new state on the territory of Serbia, an internationally recognized state and a member of the UN. Serbia is convinced that the Security Council will authoritatively reject all threats of violence and that this august body will clearly oppose the use of force as a way of settling the Kosovo issue, just as it would do in the case of any similar problem elsewhere.

I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to say once again clearly to all the Security Council member states that Serbia is fully committed to engage constructively and responsibly in further talks aimed at reaching a compromise solution for the southern Serbian province. It is of crucial importance to recognize all the shortcomings in the negotiation process so far and to ensure that a new international mediator concentrates on reaching a compromise solution that should respect the fundamental principle of preserving sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state of Serbia.

Serbia is fully convinced that it is possible to find such a negotiated and historically just solution. Serbs and Albanians have lived together for centuries, and for centuries Kosovo and Metohija has been a part of Serbia. Serbia is fully committed to enabling the Albanian national minority to achieve, in accordance with the SC Resolution 1244, substantial autonomy in the Province of Kosovo and Metohija. This means that the Albanians in the Province would be able to decide upon their future, manage their own affairs and protect their interests, while at the same time Serbia would, in accordance with the UN Charter, preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity. It is entirely possible to reconcile these two demands. In

such a case, it would be perfectly acceptable to Serbia to have the United Nations supervise the implementation of substantive autonomy of Kosovo and Metohija within Serbia.

The justice of Serbia's proposal may best be seen by asking whether a single national minority in the world today would reject substantive autonomy defined in this way. I believe that we are all aware that if a negative precedent is once set, and if national minorities are given the right to violate the UN Charter by dismembering existing states, this would mean that the Rubicon has been crossed. In that case nobody can foresee what dangerous consequences for global peace such a precedent might trigger.

This is why Serbia is convinced that negotiations must continue, with a new international mediator, and with the focus on finding the best form of substantive autonomy for the Province. I repeat: Serbs and Albanians have lived together for centuries, and it is impermissible to conclude, as Albanian separatists are suggesting, that living together is not possible. Genuinely democratic principles, as well as the principle of multiethnicity, involve joint responsibilities for living together. In this distribution of responsibilities, the Albanian side would exercise all the competences entailed by the mutually agreed substantive autonomy. Countries all over the world have developed a variety of arrangements to ensure autonomy for their national minorities, and it is impermissible that, in only one case, a single minority should have the right to form an independent state and reject even the highest form of autonomy as insufficient.

It is time to address the matter properly and to open direct talks between Belgrade and Pristina. Regrettably, in spite of Belgrade's insistence, such talks have not taken place so far. We have said several times that, before submitting his status proposal, Mr. Ahtisaari had organized only one meeting on the future status of Kosovo and Metohija. If we all agree on the complexity of the Kosovo problem, it surely follows that such an issue can hardly be settled at a single meeting. Strong commitment to continued dialogue as the only way of reaching a mutually acceptable solution and settling the future status of the province is necessary, and it is particularly important that all parties abide by this principle. If one side does not want to reach a solution through dialogue but resorts to threats of violence, clear mechanisms must be defined in order to prevent and punish such violence.

Mr. President, your Excellencies,

Today Serbia is proposing that further negotiations be based on a comprehensive discussion about the implementation of the SC Resolution 1244. This is the right moment to review objectively whether, and to what extent, the binding provisions of this Resolution have been implemented. More specifically, Belgrade welcomes the initiative of the Russian Federation that the Security Council appoint a fact-finding mission to visit Serbia and establish the extent to which the standards defined by the Resolution 1244 have been fulfilled to date. To start with, such a SC mission could see for itself how many Serbs expelled since 1999 have returned to the Province. It is common knowledge that since then more than 200 thousand Serbs have been forced to leave the Province. More than 40,000 Serbs have been expelled just from the capital city of the Province, Priština, so that at present there are only around 100 Serbs living there. Why cannot the expelled Serbs return to the capital city of the Province? Perhaps there could be a reason why return is not possible to some highly inaccessible areas. But the fact that expelled people cannot return to the capital of the Province due to security concerns, and that they do not feel safe in other big towns such as Peć, Prizren, Uroševac and Đakovica, is clear evidence of the extent to which standards set by the Resolution 1244 have remained unfulfilled.

Only days before this Security Council session, terrorists again shelled the mediaeval Serbian monastery of Visoki Dečani, dating to the mid 14th century, and ranked by UNESCO as part of the world cultural heritage. During the last eight years, the terrorists destroyed over 150 Serbian Orthodox churches and monasteries, many of which have been an irreplaceable part of both Serbian and European cultural heritage.

In view of all these facts, the next natural step is to take stock of the actual situation in terms of the implementation of the SC Resolution 1244. We are convinced that this is the best way to launch a new

cycle of negotiations. I stress in particular that Resolution 1244 explicitly reaffirms the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Serbia with regard to Kosovo and Metohija and – I quote – ‘calls for substantive autonomy to be secured for the Province’. This explains why it is precisely this SC Resolution that should be central to further talks on the future status of the Province.

Serbia is taking this opportunity to point out once again that the SC Resolution 1244 is binding on the Governments of all UN member states. No state may violate this Resolution, or take a unilateral position on the future status of the Province. Any unilateral recognition of Kosovo’s independence would constitute flagrant and - I stress - double violation of UN norms. Both the UN Charter and Resolution 1244 would be violated, and any state that decides to act in such an unlawful manner would directly call into question the authority of the UN. Serbia would, of course, unequivocally reject any such recognition of Kosovo and Metohija’s independence as null and void, as it would constitute direct interference on the part of such states in the internal affairs of Serbia. In that case, Serbia would ask the Security Council to act in accordance with its own Resolution 1244, so as to protect and reaffirm the territorial integrity of Serbia, as well as the inviolability of its internationally recognized borders.

Let me remind you that Serbia has adopted a new Constitution in November of 2006. Everyone has to recognize the fact that, through a referendum, over half of the total number of the adult citizens of Serbia freely expressed their will, reasserting once again that the Province of Kosovo and Metohija is an integral part of Serbia’s territory as laid down by the Constitution. In addressing the issue of Serbia’s territorial integrity, this sovereign will of the people of Serbia must be fully taken into account. With the adoption of the new Constitution of Serbia, its international state borders have been unambiguously and explicitly confirmed.

Once again I want to emphasize that Serbia is an old European state, and that it cannot permit that law and justice be trampled upon by depriving it of a part of its territory. The dignity of our country and our people are inseparably bound with Kosovo and Metohija – the place of origin of our state, of our faith, of our culture, and of our national and state identity. For Serbia, this is a question of truth, a matter of law and of basic, elementary justice.

As any other sovereign state, Serbia can only see its future within its internationally recognized borders, and upon the entirety of its territory. You can rest assured that Serbian people will never permit its state to be dismembered, nor could it ever recognize the existence of another independent state on its sovereign territory.

Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity to present the position of Serbia, to inform the Security Council that Serbia has rejected the Ahtisaari proposal, and to request that the Security Council support further negotiations, with a new international mediator, this time taking the UN SC Resolution 1244 as a clear and firm framework for reaching a negotiated settlement.

Thank you for the attention with which you heard me out.

This address can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=32983>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]

Sent: Friday, April 27, 2007 4:19 PM

To: 'Balkan Update'

Subject: UN Security Council mission to determine level of fulfillment of standards in Kosovo

Balkan Update

UN Security Council mission to determine level of fulfillment of standards in Kosovo Government of Serbia Press Release April 26, 2007

Belgrade – Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica met today with a delegation of the mission of the UN Security Council, led by Belgian Ambassador to the UN Johan Verbeke and underlined that it is very important that the mission establishes the real level of fulfilment of standards in Kosovo-Metohija and implementation of UN SC Resolution 1244.

He said that Serbia participated in a constructive manner at the negotiations in Vienna and offered a proposal for the future status of Kosovo, based on fundamental principles of international law, the UN Charter, Resolution 1244 and the Serbian Constitution, and that is substantial autonomy within Serbia.

The Serbian Prime Minister said that the proposal of Martti Ahtisaari is not the result of the negotiations, but the UN Special Envoy took into consideration only the interests of the Albanian side. He added that Ahtisaari's plan is illegitimate and illegal and that it violates the UN Charter and the Serbian Constitution.

Kostunica underlined that blackmail and threats of Albanian separatists if Kosovo-Metohija does not become independent are impermissible and stressed that the international community must immediately react in the harshest manner to blackmail.

The UN Charter guarantees sovereignty and territorial integrity to all states and Serbia cannot and must not be an exception.

The facts clearly speak that UN SC Resolution 1244 is not respected in Kosovo-Metohija, the Serbian Prime Minister said and added that two-thirds of the Serbian and other non-Albanian population has been expelled from the province, 200,000 Serbs cannot return to their homes, churches and monasteries are being destroyed although many of them are under the protection of UNESCO, and Serbian houses have been destroyed and looted.

Serbs live in isolated enclaves, they are victims of ethnically-motivated violence every day and the perpetrators of that violence are not being sought after and punished, Kostunica reiterated.

He said that 40,000 Serbs used to live in Pristina, while today there are only 87 of them and asked why Serbs, if they cannot return to some distant areas, cannot return to Pristina either. He underlined that there is no multi-ethnicity in Kosovo-Metohija and that the only multi-ethnic city in the province today in Northern Mitrovica.

The Prime Minister said that the real situation in Kosovo does not correspond to reports submitted by UNMIK chiefs to the SC and invited members of the mission to visit enclaves, Serbs in collective centres and talk with them.

Kostunica stressed that the Serbian government expects from the UN SC to take measures to provide

6/13/2007

return of 200,000 exiled Serbia and to create conditions for their normal life as well as to thoroughly examine application of all standards from UN SC Resolution 1244 and to start new and real negotiations.

The Prime Minister handed over the documents precisely listing all ethnically motivated crimes against the Serbs in the province and no investigation of those crimes. The documents also contain precise data on number of exiled Serbs living in collective centres.

Belgian Ambassador to the UN Johan Verbeke said that the aim of the visit of the UN SC mission is to get assured of the real situation in Kosovo-Metohija and to make a report on it.

Coordinator of the negotiating team for Kosovo-Metohija Slobodan Samardzic expounded on negotiations on the future status of Kosovo-Metohija in Vienna.

Samardzic recalled that only one of those meetings was organised on top level – on June 24, 2006, whereas 15 meetings referred to technical issues, noting that from September 2006 to February 2007 there was not a single meeting.

He added that after Ahtisaari presented his proposal, meetings referred only to six chapters of that plan whereas seven chapters were not discussed at all. Samardzic also said that amendments that Belgrade proposed were rejected.

Coordinator of the negotiating team for Kosovo-Metohija Leon Kojen presented Belgrade's plan for substantial autonomy of Kosovo-Metohija.

President of the Coordinating Centre for Kosovo-Metohija Sanda Raskovic-Ivic told the mission members that according to UNHCR, only 5% of the exiled returned home, whereas the Serbian data shows that the percentage is even smaller than 2%.

Raskovic-Ivic recalled that since 1999 there have been 7,000 assaults against Serbs, 4,500 of which were firearm attacks. She added that 931 Serbs were killed while UNMIK is investigating only 90 cases.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=33594>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 4:19 PM
To: 'Balkan Update'
Cc: BGR Lobbyists (bgrlobbyists@bgrdc.com); 'kwolf@bgrdc.com'; 'mpappas@bgrdc.com'
Subject: Serbia: Prime Minister Kostunica offers supervised autonomy for Kosovo

Balkan Update

1) Prime Minister Kostunica: Monitored autonomy real compromise which excludes all extreme options

Government of Serbia Press Release
April 29, 2007

2) Koštunica offers supervised autonomy for Kosovo

B92 News
April 29, 2007

1) Prime Minister Kostunica: Monitored autonomy real compromise which excludes all extreme options

Government of Serbia Press Release
April 29, 2007

Belgrade – Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica said today that the concept of monitored autonomy presented by the Serbian government is a real compromise which excludes all extreme options, and unlike monitored independence, it does not violate, but is in accordance with the UN Charter and the Serbian Constitution.

In a statement to the news agency Tanjug, Kostunica stressed that Serbia is completely willing to take major steps in finding a good and viable solution for Kosovo-Metohija and due to that it has forwarded the plan for monitored autonomy for the province.

According to Kostunica, in Serbia's proposal, monitored autonomy implies that on one hand ethnic-Albanians will be able to determine their future and realise their interests in the province, and on the other hand, Serbia will retain her territorial integrity and sovereignty in accordance with the UN Charter.

Monitored autonomy can reconcile these two elements because it would be perfectly acceptable for Serbia that the UN Security Council monitors the implementation and fulfillment of this form of autonomy for Kosovo-Metohija within Serbia, stressed Kostunica.

The UN Security Council Mission, which was able to ascertain the real situation in the province even during a short visit, can fully count on Serbia's readiness to begin new negotiations, and the concept of monitored autonomy can provide the best basis for new negotiations, concluded the Serbian Prime Minister.

This Press Release can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=33659>

2) Koštunica offers supervised autonomy for Kosovo

B92 News
April 29, 2007

Supervised autonomy is the true compromise that eliminates any extreme outcome, the prime minister has said.

2007 JUN 29 PM 4:21
CRM/ISS/REGISTRATION UNIT

Metohija," Koštunica said, explaining the supervised autonomy proposal Serbia came up with.

"The UN Security Council mission, which could see with their own eyes what the real situation in the province is, can count on Serbia to always be ready to start new talks and that the supervised autonomy proposal is the best basis for any future negotiations," Koštunica told the Beta news agency.

"On the one hand, Albanians will be able to take their future in their own hands and protect their interests, on the other, Serbia would preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity according to the UN Charter" Koštunica said.

"Supervised autonomy only solution"

Supervised autonomy concept should serve as basis for the Kosovo status settlement, Belgrade negotiating team members said earlier Sunday.

"The concept of supervised autonomy is a legal basis upon which it is possible to institutionally integrate Kosovo into the legal and political system of Serbia," advisor to the Serbian prime minister and Belgrade negotiating team coordinator Slobodan Samardžić said Saturday.

In a statement given to the Tanjug news agency, Samardžić explained that the concept of "supervised autonomy" presented to the UN mission by prime minister Vojislav Koštunica on April 26 was "Serbia's answer to the plan of supervised independence", the government reported on its website

"The UN mission is now familiar with this concept which will receive far more attention than before," he said.

Negotiating team member Aleksandar Simić told Tanjug that the concept presented the only solution for the Kosovo issue, as it "respects international law, while at the same time offering ethnic Albanians the opportunity for self-governance, without the influence of authorities in Belgrade and Serbs. "

"The plan envisages that Albanians have all legislative, executive and judicial jurisdiction, with the exception of the areas of foreign policy and defense, customs and border control, monetary policy and protection of Serbian cultural and religious heritage in the province," Simić explained.

He stressed that their connection with the rest of Serbia would be minimal, and they would have a large degree of autonomy, as well as constitutional guarantees and international legal guarantees in the form of agreements for that type of autonomy.

According to Simić, "the Kosovo Albanians could have representatives in the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, considering the fact that they would not be able to form and maintain international relations and conclude international agreements."

He added that they could also have representatives in the National Bank of Serbia, if they wished to participate in some elements of monetary policy running.

Simić said that the idea is to "demilitarize the territory of Kosovo", implying that there would be "no armed presence in the province, apart from international forces."

"International forces would be obliged to guarantee peace and security, and a certain period, which may last 20 years, could be used to improve relations between Serbs and Albanians," Simić concluded.

This article can also be found at: http://www.b92.net/eng/news/in_focus.php?id=91&start=0&nav_id=40968

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.

Balkan Update

From: Balkan Update [balkanupdate@balkanupdate.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2007 11:31 AM
To: 'Balkan Update'
Subject: Serbia adopts initiative for beginning new phase of negotiations on Kosovo-Metohija status

Balkan Update

Government adopts Initiative for beginning new phase of negotiations on Kosovo-Metohija status Official Website of the Serbian Government May 25, 2007

Belgrade – The Serbian government adopted at its session today the, “Initiative of the Republic of Serbia for beginning a new phase of negotiations on the future status of Kosovo-Metohija,” and forwarded it to UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon.

The text of the Initiative directed to the UN Secretary General in entirety reads:

“Starting with the generally accepted fact that negotiations on the future status of Kosovo-Metohija, which were conducted from February 21, 2006 to March 10, 2007, did not lead to a proposal for a solution based on agreement,

Keeping in mind the content of the Comprehensive Proposal for the Kosovo Status Settlement, which was submitted to the UN Secretary General by Special Envoy for negotiations Marti Ahtisaari, as well as the fact that the content is absolutely unacceptable for Serbia, which is reflected in the clear stand of the state organs of Serbia and in the large number of amendments made by the Serbian negotiating team on the Comprehensive Proposal,

Keeping in mind also the essential objections made by Serbia to the manner of conducting these negotiations which was an important reason for their failure,

Turning the attention of all UN members and the international community towards the clear intentional outcome of the Comprehensive Proposal in view of the violation of the UN Charter and related Security Council resolutions (1160, 1199, 1203 from 1998 and 1239 and 1244 from 1999) by proposing granting of independent status to a province within the borders of Serbia, a democratic internationally recognised state and UN member,

Calling upon all international participants to contribute to a peaceful, lasting, viable and comprehensive solution for the Kosovo-Metohija issue based on the principles, norms and good traditions of international law on which today’s international order rests,

The Serbian government presents the initiative for beginning a new phase of negotiations between representatives of Serbia and representatives of the interim organs of self-government in Kosovo-Metohija.

The main aim of the new phase of negotiations is to reach a solution based on agreement for the future status of Kosovo-Metohija between the sides involved.

Such a solution, with international mediation, would guarantee long-term stability and become a condition for the economic and social development of the region.

In order to reach this goal it is necessary to create a positive atmosphere for negotiations, and present

6/13/2007

suitable procedure and provide an adequate time framework without imposing artificial deadlines.

In presenting this initiative, aware of the historical importance of a just solution to the problem, the Serbian government is to the greatest degree willing to take responsibility for the successful course and conclusion of negotiations”.

This Statement can also be found at: <http://www.srbija.sr.gov.yu/vesti/vest.php?id=34357>

Note: Barbour Griffith & Rogers, LLC has filed registration statements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act with regard to its representation and dissemination of information on behalf of the Government of Serbia. Additional information is on file with the Foreign Agents Registration Unit of the Department of Justice in Washington DC.